HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 309 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 6, 2018
(Part A)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 6, 2018

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayer

● (1405)

[*English*]

The Speaker: We will now have the singing of *O Canada*, led by our wonderful pages.

[*Members sang the national anthem*]

The Speaker: Well done. An outstanding rendition.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*Translation*]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, QD): Mr. Speaker, this is Canadian Environment Week, and climate change will be one of the issues the Prime Minister raises at the G7 meeting. As usual, he will take official photos with world leaders and celebrate the historic progress made under his leadership.

Curiously, this is also the week he decided to go to Alberta to visit the pipeline he just bought with Quebeckers' money. This new acquisition means Canada can triple the amount of bitumen it sells to western and Asian markets.

At least 350 more oil tankers will pass through unique Pacific coast ecosystems every year, yet the Prime Minister has the gall to talk about marine pollution at the G7. Seriously. His blatant hypocrisy will make it clear to his global partners that Canada intends to play an environmentally destructive role in the fight against climate change.

* * *

ACADIAN GAMES

Mr. Pat Finnigan (Miramichi—Grand Lake, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year the greater Miramichi area will be hosting the Jeux de l'Acadie for the first time. This is the 39th such gathering of Acadian and francophone communities from the four Atlantic provinces since 1979. Over 3,000 athletes will take part in 11 sporting events and cultural activities.

It is not just the athletes who take part in this annual event. Over 3,500 volunteers give over 600,000 hours of their time. With a budget of over $350,000 and a total of 27,000 visitors expected by the end of the Jeux de l'Acadie, the event should generate over $1.6 million in economic benefits.

[*English*]

From June 27 to July 1, the Acadian community of Miramichi, as well as all Miramichiers, will proudly roll out the red carpet and welcome everyone from across Atlantic Canada.

[*Translation*]

In 2018, Miramichi is the place to be.

* * *

[*English*]

STORMONT—DUNDAS—SOUTH GLENGARRY SERVICE AWARD

Mr. Guy Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last year I had the honour and privilege to honour 150 worthy individuals across Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry by awarding them the SDSG Canada 150 Service Award. These individuals had demonstrated commitment and dedication to our community through volunteerism and public service.

The response across the riding was overwhelming. Because there are so many quality volunteers in our riding, many deserving constituents did not receive an award. Therefore, I am delighted to announce that the SDSG Service Award will return on an annual basis.

The SDSG Service Award is awarded in recognition of residents in Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry who have made outstanding contributions to their communities. I am asking everyone across Canada who knows deserving constituents living in SDSG to please nominate them for the 2018 award. Nomination forms and details can be found on my website, at guylauzon.ca.

The Speaker: I should point out that there is no problem with members saying their own names.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PARALYMPIC SPORTS

Mr. Stéphane Lauzon (Parliamentary Secretary for Sport and Persons with Disabilities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, we are fortunate to welcome to the Hill people from the Paralympic Foundation of Canada as part of the ImagiNation campaign.

[*English*]

The Paralympic Foundation of Canada launched ImagiNation in 2017, a four-year initiative to ensure that more Canadians with a disability are given the opportunity to choose sport and to become athletes who excel on the world stage. ImagiNation will increase access to coaching, equipment, and training environments for thousands of Canadians with a disability as well as invest in individuals with the drive and talent to compete on the world stage.

[*Translation*]

Our government is honoured to work with the Paralympic Foundation of Canada and to provide financial support to ensure that Canadians with a disability can incorporate sports into their lives. Whether we are talking about a local game or a paralympic podium, we are working to create a healthy and accessible Canada that is open to all.

* * *

● (1410)

CARMEL MOREAULT

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on May 1 at 7:15 p.m., Carmel Moreault, a firefighter from Témiscouata-sur-le-Lac had just finished dinner with his partner when he got a call about an alarm at the Cascades plant. At 8 p.m., he texted his partner telling her not to wait up because there was a fire.

Fifteen minutes later, she received a call from the station chief informing her that Carmel had had an accident. The sprinkler system had filled a ventilation pipe with water, and he was crushed by the pipe. Carmel Moreault did not survive. He was the first firefighter from Témiscouata-sur-le-Lac to die in the line of duty.

I saw so much love from his community at his funeral. More than 250 firefighters from Quebec and New Brunswick were there to show their solidarity and pay tribute to him one last time.

I want to offer my sincere condolences to his family, and in particular his partner, Sylvie, his children, the mother of his children, and his mother, Lucienne, as well as his colleagues from stations 35 and 36 in Témiscouata-sur-le-Lac.

This tribute pales in comparison to the sacrifice Carmel made for his community.

* * *

[*English*]

KILLICK COAST GAMES

Mr. Nick Whalen (St. John's East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, from St. Thomas parish to Logy Bay is a breathtaking and treacherous area of my riding known locally as the Killick Coast. The brave and hardy inhabitants are well known for their history, camaraderie, and competitive spirit.

This August, Torbay plays host to athletes aged 11 to 17 from the communities of Portugal Cove–St. Philip's, Flatrock, Bauline, Pouch Cove, and Logy Bay-Middle Cove-Outer Cove in a variety of team sports as part of the 13th annual Killick Coast games. A hallmark of the games are the honorary patrons, community leaders who have contributed to sport and youth mentorship and whose accomplishments are to be celebrated.

Most importantly, the athletes foster lifelong friendships that preserve community attachment. Organizations like the Killick Coast Games that build communities deserve our support. I invite the House to rise with me and show support for the Killick Coast and its commitment to lifelong support for sport, friendship, and community.

* * *

TAXATION

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not like to be told what to think or how to behave by their government. This is what the Liberals are doing with their carbon tax, shaping behaviour through taxes to force compliance with the Liberal agenda. The problem with a carbon tax is that it takes the market out of the equation and undervalues innovators and entrepreneurs. The Liberal one-size-fits-all solution of taxing Canadians to bend their behaviour is demeaning and counterproductive.

In Saskatchewan, we value our environment and our economy through renewable energy, crop diversification, zero tillage, forestry management, and infrastructure planning, just to name a few. Saskatchewan is full of innovative people. Look at the modern farm equipment, all invented by farmers solving problems without government interference. Innovations like catalytic converters, carbon scrubbers, electric cars, and solar panels were neither invented by government nor inspired by taxes.

Entrepreneurs and researchers are our best resource to create solutions that everyday Canadians are motivated to embrace and implement. The misguided Liberal government needs to scrap this tax and get out of the way.

* * *

PRIME MINISTER'S AWARDS

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate two educators from my riding of Don Valley East on receiving the 2018 Prime Minister's Award. This award recognizes exceptional teaching practices and a commitment to inspiring students.

The first recipient is Hafiz Printer, who teaches grades 10 to12 at the Ismaili Tariqah and Religious Education Board Canada. Mr. Printer is admired by his students for engaging them in their learning. He fosters a safe classroom environment for students to openly debate and learn.

The second recipient is Ms. Isabelle Wong, a kindergarten teacher at St. Ignatius of Loyola Catholic School. Ms. Wong focuses on character development to ensure that her students become responsible citizens and lifelong learners.

I am proud to honour these two educators for their remarkable achievements and their excellence in teaching. I hope their students are inspired to do better.

RETIREMENT CONGRATULATIONS

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the delightful privileges of this job is the joy of meeting and working with people so accomplished as to make one wonder what one has done with one's life. Bruce Kidd is one such person. He recently retired from the University of Toronto Scarborough campus as principal and vice-president. Those of us of a certain age will know Bruce as an Olympic athlete and a Commonwealth champion. Others will know him as a scholar, others as a university administrator, and still others as a human rights advocate.

The Bruce Kidd I know, however, is a gentle, wise, and skilled man who represented the very best of UTSC. As with many great people, he listened before he spoke. He thought before he acted, and he attributed to others the credit that was rightly his. He was very modest about his accomplishments.

No one could begrudge Bruce a long and comfortable retirement. However, I doubt that he will actually retire. I look forward to seeing Bruce in his next reincarnation after his so-called retirement.

* * *

● (1415)

RELAY FOR LIFE

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I look around the chamber and I do not see anyone who has not been affected by cancer. A loved one, a friend, a colleague, no one is immune. This weekend, I will be participating in the 26th annual Canadian Cancer Society's Prince George version of Relay for Life. It will mark my 19th year of participating in the Relay for Life. The last two years, I walked the full 24 hours, and this year I have set my goal to walk the full 24 hours as well. I walk for those whom we have lost. I walk for those who have beaten cancer, like my brother Trent, who is my hero. He has beaten it not once, but twice. I also walk for those who are in a fight for their lives as we speak. I walk because I know cancer can be beaten.

Today, I issue a challenge to the member for York Centre, and indeed to all members, to join me in the fight, participate this weekend in a walk in their area, or donate to cancer.ca, and let us end this deadly disease now.

* * *

WELLAND ROSE FESTIVAL

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Welland, Ontario has been known as the Rose City since 1921. Since it began, in June 1961, the Welland Rose Festival has brought together people from across Niagara to celebrate the heritage and traditions of the city for which the world-famous canal is named. Beginning with the coronation ball, the month-long rose festival includes family events across the city, such as an art show, a fishing derby, concerts, and a grand parade.

Please join me, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating and expressing our sincere appreciation to all the staff, sponsors, and volunteers who present the 57th annual Welland Rose Festival.

GRANDMOTHERS ADVOCACY NETWORK

Mrs. Karen McCrimmon (Kanata—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I stand today to welcome the amazing women who have come to the House from across the country representing the Grandmothers Advocacy Network, or GRAN. GRAN is a phenomenal organization that is actively involved in advocating for the human rights of grandmothers and their children. Its campaigns support the United Nations sustainable development goals of health, education, and gender equality, working to increase access to life-saving medication, improve access to quality education, and end violence against women and girls.

This afternoon, GRAN is holding an event in room 330, Wellington Building, from 4:00 to 5:30, or maybe just a bit later. I invite all my colleagues to join me at the event this afternoon to participate in a dialogue about the need for inclusion of African grandmothers in a feminist international agenda.

I welcome everyone from GRAN and encourage them to keep up the incredible work.

* * *

74TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 74 years ago today, in 1944, more than 150,000 allied soldiers assaulted occupied Europe from the air, sea, and land, turning the tide of the Second World War on D-Day. Over 14,000 Canadians would participate in this historic battle on the shores of Normandy. Canadian troops bravely stormed Juno Beach and decisively defeated the entrenched Nazis. Our heroic soldiers captured more enemy territory on that day than did any of our allies.

This serves as a testament to the true strength of character and resolve that existed with the members of the Canadian Armed Forces then, as today. Three hundred and fifty-nine Canadians paid the ultimate price to liberate others from the perilous oppression of Nazi occupation. We must never forget their sacrifice, their courage, and their sheer determination in the face of overwhelming odds.

As Canadians, we thank those who came before us and sacrificed their lives so that we may live peacefully in the greatest nation on Earth, our home and native land, Canada.

* * *

● (1420)

PORTUGUESE HERITAGE MONTH

Ms. Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, *boa tarde*.

Last month, during the state visit of the Portuguese prime minister, António Costa, both he and our Prime Minister paid tribute to the Portuguese community and its contributions to Canada. They both expressed pride that this year, for the first time ever at the national level, Canada will be celebrating June as Portuguese Heritage Month, and June 10 as Portugal Day.

I would like to thank all the Portuguese leaders, clubs, associations, and media, not only in my riding, Davenport, but also across the country, who have tirelessly promoted the Portuguese culture, language, and community. They serve as an inspiration for this national recognition. It is to honour them and their aspirations for the Portuguese to be recognised at the highest level of our nation and be celebrated for their many contributions to Canada.

Whether cheering on Ronaldo during the World Cup, singing along to a Shawn Mendes tune, or eating *pastéis de nata*, Portugal's famous custard tart, we should take the time to celebrate Portugal this month.

Viva Portugal, and viva Canada. *Obrigada.*

* * *

NORTH ISLAND—POWELL RIVER

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to serve the people of North Island—Powell River.

It is the Local Hero Awards that happened in several communities in my riding, and the fact that the community of Woss was awarded the courage and bravery award, recognizing the incredible power of a community that faced the worst of tragedies with courage and bravery.

It is the totem pole raised at North Island Secondary School in Port McNeill. Over 1,000 community members came together, indigenous and non-indigenous, to celebrate reconciliation. It is the tears of the elders who watched, many of them residential school survivors, who never thought the day would come when their grandchildren would dance around a totem pole that stands in front of their school.

It is all the cadets in my riding who support their communities so well, most recently the Powell River Royal Canadian Army Cadets, who recognized their cadets and shared the challenges of rural and remote community cadets programs.

What an honour it is to represent people who work so hard, who care about their communities so much, and who remember one another during the hardest of times. I am proud and humbled to serve them.

* * *

[*Translation*]

D-DAY

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, June 6, 1944, D-Day, the longest day, marked a turning point in human history. On that day, 132,000 American, British, French, and Canadian troops stormed the Atlantic Wall in Normandy to liberate Europe from Nazi oppression.

Over 14,000 Canadian heroes from across the country went ashore that day, and 355 never returned. This was the first day of a gruelling operation that would drag on for nearly three months. The Canadians' efforts made it possible to push inland to Caen, paving the way for the liberation of France and western Europe.

As a former commanding officer of the Régiment de la Chaudière, which is celebrating its 150th anniversary in 2019 and was the only French-Canadian regiment to take part in the Juno Beach landing, I am especially honoured to commemorate this historic day.

In memory of all those who fell on the battlefield fighting for freedom, let us show our undying gratitude to these heroes by saying, "Never again".

Acre Perennius!

* * *

[*English*]

74TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. Sven Spengemann (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the 74th anniversary of the D-Day invasion. We pause to reflect on what took place on the shores of Normandy and pay our respects to the fallen.

Alongside allied forces, thousands of Canadian soldiers played a crucial part in the D-Day offensive to liberate France.

[*Translation*]

We must never forget the 340 Canadians who died at Juno Beach on this day alone in 1944. Many more would perish as the Allies advanced into western Europe. Their heroism and their courage will forever be etched in our memories. These men and women fought selflessly to give us the freedom and opportunities we all enjoy today.

The events of that day shaped our identity as a nation.

[*English*]

We must never forget the sacrifices made by Canadian veterans on D-Day. Our veterans represent the very best of Canada, having put their lives on the line in the defence of democracy, freedom, and justice.

Lest we forget.

ORAL QUESTIONS

● (1425)

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, during his interview on U.S. television last weekend, the Prime Minister spoke about NAFTA negotiations on supply management.

The Prime Minister said, "We were moving towards flexibility in those areas that I thought was very, very promising."

What concessions has the Prime Minister made on supply management?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our party created supply management. Our party has always unequivocally defended supply management. We will continue to do so. Dairy producers in Quebec and across Canada know just how much we support for them.

We will always defend the supply management system. However, if the Conservatives want to talk about supply management, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition why he appointed someone who opposes supply management as the critic for innovation and economic development.

[*English*]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have known for a long time that under this U.S. administration, our trade relationship has been volatile and under grave risk.

Given this, can the Prime Minister tell us how much money was set aside in his budget and where we might find any mention of a contingency plan to deal with the trade disruption between Canada and the United States?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have said from the very beginning, with this particular American administration, we have to be ready for everything, and we are.

That is why, as soon as the U.S. put forward punitive, unacceptable tariffs on steel and aluminum in Canada, we were, right away, ready with a list of retaliatory measures that target American companies and American producers for which there are alternatives available to Canadian citizens.

We know that tariffs end up hurting the citizens of the country that brings them in. We want to avoid hurting Canadians. That is why we are consulting with Canadians on those retaliatory measures.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's own officials have confirmed that the deficit for this year will be over $18 billion.

Can the Prime Minister tell us if he has any idea how much higher the deficit will be as a result of any support that may be necessary for the industries and workers affected by the trade disruption between the United States and Canada?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite well knows that the government will be there for workers and industries affected by these punitive American measures. That is what I told steel and aluminum workers over the past months as I travelled across the country to engage with them.

It is interesting that the member opposite speaks about deficits. In the last election, Canadians had a very clear choice. The Conservatives, their choice, their option, was actually austerity and cuts. Our proposal to Canadians was investing in the middle class and the people working hard to join it, investing in our communities, and growing the economy the way the Conservatives were not able to for 10 years.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' budget has in fact turned out to be built on borrowing and tax cuts on those very same middle-class Canadians they pretend to want to help.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Sorry, tax hikes.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. We all like applause, most of the time, but not necessarily always. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives are always thinking about tax cuts. I will correct the blues after this to make sure they reflect tax hikes.

On the subject of tariffs, we know that tariffs collected by the government will raise revenue for the Government of Canada. Will the Prime Minister assure the House and Canadians that any new revenue for the government will be used to lower taxes for affected workers and the businesses that employ them?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite pointed out that he thinks about tax cuts. The issue is that Conservatives think about tax cuts for the wealthiest Canadians.

The first thing we did was bring in a tax cut for the middle class, and we raised taxes on the wealthiest 1%. For 10 years, Conservatives tried to put forward an agenda for growth that was focused on giving benefits and boutique tax cuts to the wealthiest Canadians, hoping that somehow it would trickle down to everyone else.

It did not, which is why the Conservatives had terrible growth for 10 years. We are investing in the middle class and those working hard to join it, and giving them more money—

● (1430)

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, now more than ever Canada needs to open up new markets and diversify our trading relationships. The trans-Pacific partnership would achieve just that. Despite the Prime Minister's delaying and jeopardizing that deal, it is essential that the bill implementing the deal be passed quickly.

When will the Prime Minister commit to introducing the legislation for this trade agreement and can he commit that it will be passed before the House rises?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the work we have done in diversifying Canada's trade. Under this government, we signed the CETA deal with Europe and we actually moved forward on a CPTPP, which highlights that a progressive trade deal can work for our workers and for the growing economies of Asia. We are pleased with our record on trade and growth.

We are happy to announce that we will be introducing into the House the bill for the ratification of the new CPTPP before the House rises for the summer.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister promised Canadians he would be a climate change leader, and he committed to eliminate public subsidies for oil and gas companies.

However, climate change leaders do not buy pipelines with public money. Climate change leaders do not allow $3 million bonuses to be given to top oil executives. Climate change leaders do use public money to build long-term job creation in renewable energies.

Could the government explain why it makes sense for a climate change leader to buy a pipeline?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we made a commitment to Canadians that said we understood we needed to grow the economy and protect the environment together. Those on the other side of the House would have Canadians believe that there is still a choice to be made between what is good for the economy and what is good for the environment. We on this side of the House know they must go together.

That is why we are moving forward with a world-class oceans protection plan, a national price on carbon pollution, and getting our resources to new markets, other than the United States, for our oil. That is what we know we need to do. That is what we are going to keep doing, despite the false choice proposed by the members opposite.

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we hear the government just spent $4.5 billion in renewable energies, but it spent it on a pipeline.

[*Translation*]

Last week, the majority of MPs had the good sense to vote in favour of the bill introduced by my colleague from Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou to enshrine the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People in Canadian law. The Prime Minister himself voted in favour of it.

How can he say he respects indigenous rights while forcing a pipeline through despite opposition from a number of first nations?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had the privilege of sitting down with representatives of indigenous communities that will be affected by this new pipeline. We talked about the impact on their communities. We have set up a committee to consult and listen to communities. We will ensure that the pipeline has a positive impact, and we will minimize any negative repercussions.

I am proud of the reconciliation work we are doing. We will keep working with all indigenous peoples. We will listen to them. We will respect all points of view.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in 2015, the Prime Minister was a superstar, a breath of fresh air, and a new champion of the environment. Three years later, everyone is shaking their heads. What happened to Canada? What happened to Mr. Selfie, to Paris Match's new pet?

After adopting Stephen Harper's targets, the Prime Minister bought a pipeline. Today, we learned that Canada ranks lowest among the G7 countries when it comes to eliminating oil subsidies. We came in seventh out seven.

Will the Prime Minister finally keep his promise, do the right thing, and eliminate all oil subsidies?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 2015, the choice was clear for Canadians.

The NDP was proposing to make Canadians choose between what is good for the environment and what is good for the economy. The Liberal Party told Canadians that we understood how important it was to create a strong economy while protecting the environment. The two go hand in hand.

That is exactly what we are doing. We are putting a national price on carbon pollution, implementing a historic oceans protection plan, and securing new markets for our resources.

That is what Canadians expect.

● (1435)

[*English*]

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister prepares to play host to the G7, Canadians and many around the world are asking themselves, "What happened to this guy?"

We all remember that great defender of the planet who promised to end fossil fuels subsidies. However, a new report shows that when it comes to the G7 and those same subsidies, Canada ranks seventh out of seven. That would be last. That would be after Donald Trump's America.

Therefore, rather than eliminate the subsidies, the Prime Minister went out and bought a 65-year-old pipeline. When will he end this circle of hypocrisy and finally come clean with Canadians and keep his promise to them and to the world?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to reinforce that we have indeed committed, and are on track, to phase out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies by the year 2025. To do this, we announced in our very first budget the expiration of the tax writeoffs on capital investments in LNG facilities. In budget 2017, we announced the elimination of certain tax credits for exploration expenses in the oil and gas sector. We are developing our resources while protecting our environment, including safeguarding our oceans and combatting climate change.

Our government understands that a clean environment and a strong economy go hand in hand.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE AND AGRIFOOD

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every day the Liberal government demonstrates how completely out of touch it is with the farming community. The Liberals called our farmers tax cheats and are imposing a carbon tax that farmers do not want. They are changing Canada's food guide and imposing labels that make no sense on agricultural products. All their actions are having so-called unintended consequences on farmers.

My question for the Prime Minister is quite simple. Does he also believe that yogourt, cheese, and fruit juice are a health hazard?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are very proud of the support we provide to our farmers. The Conservatives cut nearly $700 million from agriculture budgets, whereas we are investing in hard-working Canadian farmers.

We reached a trade agreement with Europe that will increase our agricultural exports by over $1.5 billion per year, and the comprehensive progressive agreement on the trans-Pacific partnership will boost them by over $1 billion a year. We invested $350 million to help dairy producers and processors modernize their operations, and we will always support Canadian farmers.

[*English*]

Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, farmers are struggling to survive and the Liberal imposed taxes are not helping. Now the agriculture minister is claiming that farmers support the Liberal carbon tax.

The chair of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers said, "I'm not sure who has been briefing [the] Minister... but he is dead wrong if he thinks that most farmers support a carbon tax."

Does the Prime Minister agree with the minister that farmers like his carbon tax or will he listen to farmers and recognize that the carbon tax is crippling our farm families?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives like to talk a good game on farmers, but the reality is different. While the previous government cut nearly $700 million from agriculture and agrifood, we have invested in hard-working Canadian farmers.

Our government signed CETA, which will boost our agricultural exports by one and a half billion dollars a year, and the CPTPP, which will boost our agricultural exports by over a billion dollars a year. We have secured our $2-billion canola trade with China. We have invested $100 million in agricultural science and innovation. We have invested $350 million to help dairy farmers and processors modernize. We will always—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton.

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has a budget bill before the House of Commons right now that Finance Canada admits will raise the price of gas, home heating, and most other consumer goods that Canadians buy.

How much will the Prime Minister's carbon tax cost the average Canadian family?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, for 10 years Stephen Harper and his Conservatives did nothing on protecting the environment. However, over those years, a number of provinces stepped up and put forward a price on carbon pollution. Actually, we presently have a situation in which 80% of our citizens live in jurisdictions where there is a carbon price in effect.

We are continuing to move forward to demonstrate that a national price on carbon will be fair for those provinces that already have it and grow the economy for everyone.

● (1440)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the provinces were already doing it, the Prime Minister would not have to introduce a budget bill forcing them to do it. Clearly this is a federally imposed tax. Clearly he would have read the briefing notes that his departments have given him about the cost of that tax. He knows the cost.

Again, how much will this Liberal carbon tax imposed by the Prime Minister cost the average Canadian family?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I hate to have to correct the member opposite. In fact, it was during his government that many provinces moved forward on pricing carbon pollution.

We have a situation in which British Columbia, Alberta, Quebec, and Ontario have all moved forward with pricing of carbon pollution, and we know that it has to be done right across the country. That is exactly what we are ensuring, but we are working with the provinces to ensure they can put forward a model that works for them, as long as it is fairly stringent and impactful right across the country.

The Speaker: I am having difficulty hearing the answers. I would like to ask the member for St. Albert—Edmonton and others not to be yelling when someone else has the floor. It is very straightforward.

The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister uses the word "stringent". There is no doubt that it will have a stringent effect on household budgets. There is also no doubt the Prime Minister supports high gas prices. He said so when he was in Vancouver, celebrating $1.60 a litre gas prices. There is also no doubt that his carbon tax will raise the price of consumer goods upon which middle-class Canadians rely.

It is his bill, so how much will his carbon tax cost the average Canadian family?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unlike the years of the Harper Conservatives, we work with provinces as we move forward on pan-Canadian issues and projects. That is why we are working with provinces like Manitoba, Nova Scotia, and others to establish how they want to move forward on putting a price on pollution.

We know we need a price on pollution across the country. It needs to be equivalent and effective right across the country. However, every jurisdiction will get to determine how that money comes in and how it returns that money to the people who need it.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have no doubt that the Prime Minister will work with any politician as part of his plan to raise taxes on Canadians. It is his form of trickle-down economics. He scoops up money from working class consumers, gives it to the federal government, trickles it down to provincial politicians, and then expects us to believe that a few drops will go back to the people who originally paid for it in the first place. If that is true, then why can he not tell us this. How much will his carbon tax cost the average Canadian family?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member opposite's expertise in trickle-down economics. That is what the Conservatives specialized in for 10 years. They gave boutique tax credits to wealthy Canadians, delivered child benefit cheques to millionaire families, and then when we moved forward with lowering taxes for the middle class and raising them on the wealthiest 1%, they voted against it. Then we moved forward on a Canada child benefit to give more money to nine out of 10 Canadian families and did not send child benefit cheques to millionaires, while lifting hundreds of thousands of kids out of poverty. The Conservatives voted against it. Their positions are clear.

* * *

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Ms. Georgina Jolibois (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals voted against the NDP motion to implement the rights of indigenous peoples in their pipeline project, but just a few days ago voted to put those same rights into Canadian law.

The Prime Minister cannot pretend that indigenous voices are all the same and ignore the clear opposition to his pipeline. The Liberals are denying the rights of first nations, Métis, and Inuit people. Does the government really not see that or does it just not care?

● (1445)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I very much respect the member opposite's voice, but I do need to highlight that there are a range of voices in indigenous communities and we need to listen to all of them.

There are people in indigenous communities who were opposed to this pipeline and other economic development projects. There are some who are in favour of it. We are working with all of them, including through entities like the Indigenous Advisory and Monitoring Committee, a committee that we put together exactly for the Trans Mountain pipeline expansion.

We are going to continue to work in the spirit of reconciliation on a nation-to-nation relationship that respects UNDRIP.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of a government that talks a lot, but is always missing in action when it comes to making important decisions that affect entire indigenous communities.

Last week it voted to support the rights of indigenous peoples. This week, it is voting against our motion, which is a concrete way to support these rights.

Can the Liberals do more than just talk, and talk, and talk about the rights of indigenous people?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would say that it is the NDP that talks, and talks, and talks, while we deliver results for first nations and indigenous peoples. We have eliminated many boil water advisories, we have built schools, and we are moving forward with partnerships on governance and on treaties. We are working hand in hand with indigenous communities across the country to keep our promise of nation-to-nation reconciliation.

We will continue to respectfully work with first nations without claiming to speak for them like the NDP does.

* * *

[*English*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in March, the President of the United States announced that he would be introducing tariffs on steel and aluminum. After that, he announced there would be an exemption for Canada and Mexico until May 1. He then announced a further extension of that exemption until June 1. Most recently, he indicated that, of course, the exemption was going to be lifted. All through that time, the Prime Minister had an opportunity to consult on the tariffs that he is now proposing to counter the steel and aluminum tariffs. My question is simple. Why did he wait so long and put us in a position where we cannot react right away?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to pause to thank Canadians. Over the past months, and indeed over a year now, Canadians have been united in our approach to dealing with the U.S. administration. Across political lines, across provincial capitals, across industries, Canadians have been speaking with a clear and united voice that we stand together and that we stand against punitive measures by the United States, that we will support our neighbours, that we will support our workers, and that we will remain united and proud Canadians. I want to thank all members of this House and all Canadians for the solidarity they continue to show on this issue.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians really are watching what is going on because they are quite concerned. They see an economy that is going to be put at risk and they are looking for answers from the Prime Minister. Unfortunately, today we have not received any answers from the Prime Minister. He was asked four times about how much a carbon tax would cost a Canadian family. He did not tell us the answer. He was asked how much more deficit was going to be accumulated because of the trade war we are in. He did not give us an answer. These are things that Canadians care about.

He did give us one answer. He told us that he is going to introduce legislation to affirm the CPTPP, the free-trade deal that we negotiated. Will he guarantee that it is going to pass?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I very much respect the laundry list the member put forward. However, we can list the concrete results we have delivered for Canadians over the past two and a half years. Whether it be signing the CPTPP, which the Conservatives were not moving forward on; whether it was concretizing a CETA that was in dire straits when we came into office; whether it is delivering an energy infrastructure that will get our oil resources to new markets, which they failed to do for 10 years; whether it is actually investing in infrastructure in our communities, lowering taxes for the middle class, and raising them on the wealthiest 1%, these are the things that—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister announced that the G7 would be held in La Malbaie, his government also said that workers in the region would be put to use. Unfortunately, that is not what happened. Workers everywhere are currently in a situation of forced unemployment.

Can the Prime Minister tell the people of La Malbaie whether compensation is provided for and what he is going to do for the hotel managers, innkeepers, and restaurant owners who are unable to put their employees to work before and during the G7?

● (1450)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the opportunity to visit La Malbaie in the Charlevoix region to meet with locals. They told me that they were proud to welcome the world, to show them the beauty of Charlevoix and to encourage people to come visit and discover this magnificent region.

Obviously, they know that there will be some inconveniences and challenges that come with hosting our visitors and dealing with security. We are continuously working with the public and with their elected representatives to ensure that everything goes smoothly.

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Mr. Speaker, an event like the G7 summit naturally has an impact on local residents. Everyone knows that. Not only are honest workers currently prevented from getting to their place of work, but local shops, businesses, and homes will be exposed to vandalism.

Under such circumstances, we would expect the government to look after victims of vandalism and provide compensation.

Will the Prime Minister formally promise to compensate every victim of vandalism during the G7?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be hosting world leaders in the beautiful region of Charlevoix.

When I was there, I learned that a company from La Baie, a borough of Saguenay, won the contract to supply food to all the security and military personnel who will be present. This community will be reaping substantial profits.

I can assure my colleague that the compensation policies for affected local businesses are exactly the same as they were when the Conservatives hosted their summit in 2010.

* * *

SPORTS

Ms. Anne Minh-Thu Quach (Salaberry—Suroît, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this week we all heard the many traumatizing stories of sexual abuse from Canadian athletes. This is unacceptable, and the government must do something to protect our athletes.

National sports bodies in Canada are responsible for policing themselves in matters of sexual abuse. What is wrong with this picture? It creates conflicts of interest and endangers the safety of our athletes.

When will the government do something to keep these young athletes safe?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, harassment of any kind is unacceptable.

The safety and security of athletes, coaches, and officials is always our top priority. All Canadians deserve the opportunity to participate in a sport environment that is free of discrimination and harassment. That is why all federally-funded sport organizations must have an anti-discrimination, harassment, and abuse policy.

We are currently reviewing our existing funding policies to ensure that organizations continue to promote healthy, harassment-free environments.

[*English*]

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if policies are neglected, they are worthless. The government has to have zero tolerance for sexual abuse in Canadian sports. Right now, the onus is on sporting organizations to be responsible for policing these complaints. That is not fair to these organizations. Canada needs an independent body to handle cases of sexual abuse in Canadian sport.

Under the recent Safe Sport Act in the United States, independent bodies investigate these cases. It is time for Canada to do the same. When is the government going to step up?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government and all Canadians have been very clear. Harassment of any kind is completely unacceptable, and the safety and security of athletes, coaches, and officials is always our top priority.

All Canadians deserve the opportunity to participate in a sport environment that is free of discrimination, harassment, and harmful behaviour. That is why all federally funded sport organizations must have an anti-discrimination, harassment, and abuse policy in place to be eligible for sport support program funding, which Sport Canada reviews to ensure compliance.

We are currently reviewing our existing funding policies to ensure that organizations continue to promote harassment-free environments.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the real impact of climate change cannot be understated. The challenge governments face is striking the right balance between an evolving economy and protection of the environment now and for future generations.

The Minister of Environment and Climate Change repeatedly says that "We're all in this together" as a global community and that "international collaboration is essential to make sure we are leaving a healthy environment and a strong economy to our kids and grandkids."

Can the Prime Minister describe Canada's global plan to meet these global challenges?

● (1455)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, strong action is needed to tackle climate change, all the while generating the long-term economic development that will grow the middle class and support a clean economy.

Yesterday, on World Environment Day, we appointed Patricia Fuller as Canada's new ambassador for climate change. Working together on climate change, oceans, and clean energy is one of the key themes of our G7 presidency.

We are working to ensure that we are leaving a healthy environment and a strong economy to our kids and grandkids.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, well, we only wish that were true.

Canada is a country rich in natural resources, home to innovative businesses, and populated by hard-working Canadians. Our country should be attracting investment, but instead we are repelling it. In fact, we are so opposed to private sector investment in the energy sector that we have killed three pipeline projects worth over $100 billion. Now, we have taken $4.5 billion and given it to Kinder Morgan to take its projects elsewhere.

When will the Prime Minister stop attacking Canada's energy sector and start putting the interests of Canadians first?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the member's first comment, it is true that we just appointed Patricia Fuller as Canada's new ambassador for climate change.

On the issue of pipelines, for 10 years the Conservatives tried to move forward on getting our oil resources to new markets, and they failed. They failed because they refused to understand that the only way to grow a strong economy is to protect the environment at the same time. That is what we are demonstrating with a national price on carbon pollution, with a world-class oceans protection plan, with $8 billion worth of investment in clean energy projects and renewable technologies. We know the way—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Riverbend.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Kinder Morgan's 2017 annual report to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, it valued the Trans Mountain pipeline at $2.5 billion, and yet the Prime Minister paid $4.5 billion to purchase the pipeline. We now know that a lot of the extra padding went to executive bonuses.

If Kinder Morgan says its pipeline is worth $2.5 billion, why did the Prime Minister pay it $4.5 billion in taxpayers' money to leave Canada?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a real shame to see the trapped ideology of the Conservatives who are playing politics with this issue. I can tell them that I was just in Alberta yesterday talking to oil sands workers, talking to pipeline workers, who are deeply grateful that we are able to move forward on building this pipeline project after years of the Conservatives being unable to do so. Why were the Conservatives unable to do so? It is because they did not understand that the only way to build a strong economy is to protect the environment at the same time. This government is doing both, and that is why we are getting it done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, $4.5 billion in taxpayers' money is going directly to Houston, Texas. That is eight times more than Kinder Morgan spent on the pipeline. That is $2 billion more than Kinder Morgan itself estimated the pipeline to be worth.

When Kinder Morgan executives made that deal, they called Houston.

[*English*]

They did not say, "Houston, we have a problem". No, instead, they said, "Houston, it's party time" with $4.5 billion of Canadian taxpayers' money, thanks to the Liberal Party of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Why is the Liberal government sending $4.5 billion to Texas?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Conservatives are feeling a bit lost. For years, they have been demanding that we do what they could not, and that is to build a pipeline to give Canada access to new markets other than the United States. The Conservatives were unable to do that, but we did so, at their request. Now that we have delivered on their main demand, they have to try to find a way to attack us and play petty politics. Fortunately, workers across Canada understand that we did the right thing for them.

● (1500)

[*English*]

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before selling the Trans Mountain pipeline to the Prime Minister for $4.5 billion, Kinder Morgan valued its Canadian assets at $2.5 billion. That is quite a deal if one is Kinder Morgan. Kinder Morgan did not ask for any Canadian tax dollars. All it wanted to do was to build a pipeline.

Why did the Prime Minister pay Kinder Morgan $2 billion more than the pipeline was worth and allow Kinder Morgan to invest and create jobs outside of this country?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one almost has to feel sorry for the Conservatives. For 10 years, they tried to get this done, and were unable to do it. Then, for two and a half years, while we were in government, they have been screaming at us to get this pipeline built, and now, when we are finally getting this pipeline built, they do not know what to do with themselves. So they fall back on their silly attacks, on playing politics, on their rigid ideology that somehow, suddenly, they do not think that public investment has any place in the development of our natural resources, which, of course, the great Peter Lougheed disagreed with them about. We know that we are doing the right thing, the right way.

* * *

MARIJUANA

Mr. Murray Rankin (Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, a Senate report has just concluded that Canadians who use cannabis after it is legalized and try to cross the border to the United States could be denied entry, but worse, those who do not answer certain questions in pre-clearance could face up to two years in prison under Bill C-23, which calls it resisting or wilfully obstructing an American officer, even on Canadian soil.

Can the Prime Minister confirm whether or not Canadians who simply refuse to answer American officers in Canada about their cannabis use could face fines or imprisonment?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear about one thing. The reason we are moving forward on the legalization of marijuana is because the current system does not work. It does not protect our kids from the harmful impact of marijuana, and it delivers billions of dollars every year to criminal organizations that make profits off of that.

We are also highlighting that cannabis is not somehow a positive health food supplement that we encourage everyone to use. It is a controlled substance. We are trying to make it more difficult for kids to access, and people need to be honest when they cross the border if they choose to enter a different country.

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am going to help the Prime Minister out. Conservatives and Liberals voted for Bill C-23, which gave unprecedented powers to American border officers on Canadian soil. Luckily, the NDP was here raising exactly these concerns, because now what we are seeing in the Senate report is that with the legalization of marijuana, any person on Canadian soil, not crossing the border and subject to another country's laws, but here in Canada, could potentially be fined or imprisoned under that very legislation.

[*Translation*]

My question for the Prime Minister is simple. Is that the case, yes or no? When will he finally take that issue up with his American counterparts?

[*English*]

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are, of course, in ongoing discussions with our American counterparts on a broad range of border issues, and we will continue to be, but at the same time, I hope the NDP is not suggesting that somehow a sovereign country cannot make determinations about how it handles people entering its own borders. Of course, we would never expect or allow any other country to dictate to us who or how we can or cannot let someone into our country. We will ensure that we are also respecting other countries' sovereignty in doing that at the same time as we stand up for Canadians, and of course, for the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces were ordered to return their sleeping bags and rucksacks because of an equipment shortage.

The Prime Minister is failing our Canadian Armed Forces. Already he broke the Liberal promise and cut another $2.3 billion from defence spending. This is unacceptable. How can Canadians trust the Prime Minister to buy navy ships and fighter jets when he cannot even get buying sleeping bags right? How can we trust him to provide the right equipment to our troops who are about to deploy to Mali?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The Conservatives pretend that they are friends to our troops, but for 10 years they underinvested, they politicized, they played games with procurement, and they nickel-and-dimed our veterans, yet they are easy to stand up with inflated rhetoric any time there is a challenge.

We are going to continue to work with the men and women of our Canadian Forces to ensure that they have the equipment and the support they need to do their jobs as they stand up for Canada with their lives and livelihoods on the line. We continue to support our troops, not just with words, like them, but with dollars and cents that go the distance.

● (1505)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1944, 14,000 Canadian soldiers landed on the beaches of Normandy. On June 6, 2018, our soldiers are being asked to hand in their rucksacks and sleeping bags to the quartermaster. This is outrageous. What is the Prime Minister doing in the meantime? He is spending $10 million on Omar Khadr, $7 billion on a pipeline that a company could have taken care of itself, and $7 million on a temporary skating rink right here in front of Parliament.

Mr. Prime Minister, do you think that we are going to send our soldiers to Mali under those conditions?

The Speaker: The hon. member for Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles ought to be aware that he has to direct his comments to the chair. When he says "you" here, that usually means the Speaker. I do not think he was speaking to me.

The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is looking to politicize the fact that today is the 74th anniversary of the D-Day invasion, but we on this side of the House are thinking about what unfolded on the shores of Normandy and paying tribute to our fallen soldiers. The monumental achievements of those young men transformed this great country. Their determination to fight for freedom, democracy, peace, and security was passed down to future generations. As an expression of our gratitude to their bravery and perseverance, we thank and salute the men and women who played a pivotal role all those years ago. Lest we forget.

* * *

[*English*]

ETHICS

Mr. Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, responding to questions about the fisheries minister's surf clam decision, the minister's most senior official confirmed that the Liberal-connected Five Nations had the lowest participation of first nations out of all the applicants. She also confirmed that she had no knowledge of the minister's family connection to the unincorporated entity. She confirmed multiple times that this was the minister's sole, personal decision.

When did the minister become aware of the minister's family connections, and when did he know that Five Nations had the least amount of indigenous participation?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our decision to introduce indigenous participation is consistent with our commitment to developing a renewed relationship between Canada and indigenous peoples. Enhancing access to the Arctic surf clam fishery broadens the distribution of benefits from this public resource, and it is a powerful step toward reconciliation. When the Conservatives went through a similar process to increase access to this fishery, they chose to exclude indigenous peoples.

Of course, the member will continue to work with the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner and follow his advice.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Nicola Di Iorio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Montreal's public transit system is the most heavily used in the country. Many Montrealers make the eco-friendly choice to get around the city by metro, bus, and bike share. I am very pleased with our government's recent decision to help with planning the blue line extension to Anjou.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister how the government plans to help maintain the existing network and ensure quality service going forward.

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel for his question.

Public transit is a priority for our government because it enables Canadians to spend less time on the road and more time with their loved ones. I am proud of this week's announcement that we will be giving the Société de transport de Montréal over $450 million to help it purchase buses, build a new garage, and renovate Montreal metro system equipment.

That is what it means to invest in our communities.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, three years ago, a young Cree girl was suffering chronic pain and was taking daily medication for a jaw misalignment. She simply needed $6,000 in dental work. Instead of showing compassion and common sense, the government decided to take Josey and her family to court, for over $110,000 in costs, to fight. Seven months ago, we suggested that it was time to quit the fight and show some compassion and change the policy.

Can the Prime Minister tell us how this represents using taxpayer dollars for reconciliation?

● (1510)

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 2015, Canadians asked our government to step up on reconciliation and build a new relationship, nation to nation, with indigenous peoples, and that is exactly what we are doing. In partnership with them, in respect with them, we are working with indigenous communities across this country to respond to their needs, to deliver on the services they need, to build the housing, invest in the schools, and create the infrastructure necessary for them to determine their own future and for them to thrive in this country.

We are doing this hand in hand, in partnership, in respect, and that is what we will continue to do.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after two years, one month, and 14 days of incessant consultation, the Minister of Canadian Heritage finally made an announcement yesterday. I could hardly believe it. Did she have new measures or reforms to announce? Of course not. She announced a new panel of experts, the second in two years, which will issue its recommendations in 2020, after the next election. That is cynicism. Two years ago, the minister was bragging about her political courage and promised legislative changes in 2017.

By doing nothing for four years, is this government not jeopardizing our culture for no other reason than to get re-elected at the expense of our culture?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will continue to protect and to promote our culture.

The Broadcasting Act has not been reviewed since 1991. It predates smart phones and the ubiquitous use of the Internet. We are reviewing the act to ensure that it reflects today's realities and that the system in place is fair for everyone. The guiding principle for the review is clear: anyone who profits must contribute. No one gets a free pass.

We are also going to protect and strengthen CBC's mandate to make sure that Harper-style budget cuts can never happen again.

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Gagan Sikand (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada is generally a very safe country, but there have been recent trends of an increase in guns and gangs violence. The responsibility for keeping communities safe starts at home, and working with communities to prevent crime will help them stay safe and resilient.

Can the Prime Minister tell us what our government is doing to keep Canadian kids away from gangs, which will allow them to live full and productive lives?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we are launching a new call for proposals under the youth gang prevention program and the crime prevention action fund. These programs address the impact of gangs and violence on youth, especially in indigenous and high-needs communities. This is on top of unprecedented annual funding we announced last year of up to $100 million. We will keep working to enhance public safety by focusing on prevention, effective law enforcement, and strong community partnerships.

* * *

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Alupa Clarke (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister spoke about the review of the CRTC Act. The last time the Official Languages Act was comprehensively reviewed was when the Conservatives were in power in 1988. In light of the new challenges and issues they are dealing with, francophones, Acadians, and anglophones from Quebec are all asking that the act be reviewed. The Federal Court agrees and is asking Parliament to review the act. The Liberals are the only ones not on board.

What exactly is the Prime Minister waiting for to modernize the Official Languages Act?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Official Languages Act is important to our party and also to our country. Protecting Canada's linguistic minorities is at the core of who we are as a country. We will continue to stand up for linguistic minorities and strive to improve the Official Languages Act.

I can confirm that we are preparing to modernize the Official Languages Act. We will work with all Canadians to ensure we get it right.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

Hon. Hunter Tootoo (Nunavut, Ind.):

[*Member spoke in Inuktitut*]

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Two communities in my riding have recently declared that they are in crisis. These declarations stem from the fact that there are too few mental health supports and an increased number of suicide attempts. Of the recent $118 million announced for first nations and Inuit mental health, Nunavut receives only $500,000 annually, despite the fact that the suicide rate is 10 times the national average. The current government has sent additional support to first nations communities in crisis. Will the government do the same for Inuit communities?

Right Hon. Justin Trudeau (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we recognize that the mental health challenges facing indigenous people are deep-rooted, and the need for support is immense. In Nunavut, we are working with our partners and have invested $189 million over 10 years in the community-led Nunavut wellness agreement as well as $8.4 million, this year alone, for mental health support for Inuit. We are supporting ITK's national Inuit suicide-prevention strategy and will continue to work with partners to respond to the mental health needs in the territory.

● (1515)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou on a point of order.

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Beauport—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île d'Orléans—Charlevoix, I would like to move a motion in the House, but first I would like to give some background.

The G7, a major event, is starting soon. This kind of event sometimes attracts mass protests that sadly lead to unrest. Over the past few months, serious concerns about this event have been raised in the media or through public consultations by many residents from the ridings of Québec, represented by the Minister of Families, Louis-Hébert, represented by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Louis-Saint-Laurent, Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, and Beauport—Limoilou, where protests will—

The Speaker: Order. The member seems to be getting into debate. I would ask him to get to his question.

Mr. Alupa Clarke: Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions, and I hope you will find unanimous consent for the following motion: that the House hope for the success of the G7 meeting in La Malbaie and defend the right to protest, but denounce possible acts of violence and vandalism, thank the police forces who will be deployed this week to keep residents and visitors safe, and call on the government to formally pledge to compensate residents and business owners in the unfortunate event of unrest and damage in the Charlevoix region and in the city of Quebec.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In a moment I will be asking for unanimous consent to table some documents. The documents speak to the issue of Kinder Morgan and the fact that it valued its assets at $2.5 billion, yet the Prime Minister paid $4.5 billion.

I would like to table these documents, the SEC filings of Kinder Morgan Canada, to show that the assets are in fact valued at $2.5 billion in spite of the Prime Minister's assertion.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent of the House to table the documents?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STANDING ORDERS—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House a matter concerning the notice of time allocation regarding Bill C-59. Bill C-59 was referred to committee before second reading and is now before the House at report stage.

If you read Standing Order 78(3), Mr. Speaker, it allows a time allocation motion to cover both the report and third reading of a bill provided that the bill is consistent with Standing Order 76.1(10).

Standing Order 76.1(10) refers to a bill that was sent to committee after second reading, not before second reading.

Standing Order 76.1(10) is the Standing Order that deals with the report stage of a bill that was referred to committee before second reading and Standing Order 78(3) does not refer to it.

Therefore, there is no provision in our Standing Orders that would allow a time allocation motion to cover both the report and third reading stages of a bill that was sent to committee prior to second reading.

I concede time allocation motions have covered both the report and third reading stages of some bills that were referred to committee before second reading, however, no member had ever objected to this practice nor pointed out to the Speaker that it was simply out of order. The fact that the former opposition turned a blind eye to this breach does not make it right.

Since Bill C-59 is the first in this Parliament that has been referred to committee before second reading and notice having been given to time allocate, now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for you to take a look at this matter and ensure the government begins following the House rules.

Finally, I would add one point to my submission. Standing Order 76.1(10) deems the report stage of Bill C-59 to be an integral part of second reading. We are actually talking about two stages plus third reading, another situation not anticipated by Standing Order 78(3).

● (1520)

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Red Deer—Lacombe for raising his point of order. I will come back to the House in due course.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am pleased to inform the House that proper notice was in fact given last night. There was a point of clarification. If the member checks *Hansard* and reads just a bit further on, as a member who was here until midnight, I can assure him clarification was indeed given.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. government House leader for that.

DECORUM

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, this is not a novel point of order. It relates to Standing Order 16 and 18, but in particular to Standing Order 16, related to interrupting members when they speak, in this case, the Prime Minister.

I can assure other members that I feel like screaming a good deal of the time when I listen to the Prime Minister, but I do not. It violates the rules of this place when I cannot hear the Prime Minister deliver a response. I do not recall, from this seat, having trouble hearing Stephen Harper. I do not think he spoke louder than the current Prime Minister. The noise from this quarter of Conservatives is unacceptable. It violates our rules.

The Speaker: Order, please. Clearly I encourage members to listen and not to interrupt when someone else has the floor. I would appreciate that also when the Chair is speaking.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I am seeking the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion: That the House: 1) send good wishes for the G7 summit in Charlevoix; 2) protect the right to protest, but condemn potential acts of violence; 3) thank and congratulate the police forces that will be deployed this week to keep residents and visitors safe; and 4) support the enforcement of the same guidelines for compensating residents and business owners in the Charlevoix area and in Quebec City as those enforced by the Harper government in Huntsville in 2010.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: Order. I ask the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent and other members to stop interrupting and stop talking.

[*English*]

Order, please. I would ask the member for Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame to do that as well.

The member for Cariboo—Prince George is rising on a point of order, however, we cannot have unlimited numbers of points or order, by the way.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, in a moment I will be asking for unanimous consent. There has been a considerable amount of misinformation on that side of the House in regard to the minister's decision to award the lucrative surf clam contract to his colleague's brother and those with close family ties to the Liberal Party of Canada.

Points of Order

The minister, along with the Prime Minister, have repeatedly said this was about reconciliation, and they have misrepresented the previous government's commitment to the indigenous participation with this fishery.

Yesterday at committee the minister's most senior staff acknowledged the commitment of the previous government to aboriginal participation in this fishery. In order to clear up the government's inaccurate misrepresentation once and for all, I would like to seek unanimous consent to table the Government of Canada 2015 news release, which states:

> With this increase in TAC, the Integrated Fisheries Management Plan provision for new entrants has been triggered and, as such, Fisheries and Oceans Canada is commencing a process to introduce a new entrant or new entrants to the fishery. This process includes consultation with the current licence holder, industry and First Nations and will conclude in the coming weeks.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George have the unanimous consent of the House to table the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

● (1525)

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mrs. Cathay Wagantall (Yorkton—Melville, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to stand today in the House and express my concern in regard to comments made by our hon. Prime Minister during answering questions in regard to the carbon tax. He indicated to the House that he had worked with all the provinces and that the provinces were working toward this with him. Clearly, we all know the Province of Saskatchewan is not in agreement.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville for her additional comments. We try to avoid the continuation of question period after that time is expired.

Mr. Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In a moment I will once again be seeking unanimous support. Unfortunately, it seems the government continues to suppress the facts in the surf clam case. I would like to seek unanimous consent to table the Federal Court documents pertaining to the current case against the government in regard to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard awarding a lucrative surf clam contract to his colleague's brother and his wife's cousin. These documents—

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Points of Order

Mr. James Bezan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Today, during question, I referred to the defence spending shortfall by the government. This information comes from the document, "Strong, Secure, Engaged So Far" by David Perry of the Canadian Global Affairs Institute. I am going to ask for consent to table this.

The document states:

> ...the capital allocations to date are falling well short of the projections contained in SSE. The DND's capital allocation for 2017/2018 as of Supplementary Estimates C for 2017/2018 was $4 billion (the green dot in Figure 6). This final year-end allocation represents the maximum DND can spend on capital in 2017/2018. This is well short of the $6.3 billion in capital spending projected for 2017/2018 in SSE...

I ask for unanimous consent to table this report so Canadians can get all the information they need, as well as inform the government of all its own shortfalls.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Candice Bergen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to seek unanimous consent to table some important documents I believe the House needs to see so everybody can then have a fulsome discussion.

We asked the Prime Minister four times today, although we have actually been asking for weeks, about the price and the cost of the carbon tax. We have documents here that my hon. colleague, the member for Carleton, has worked very hard to get, which would reveal the cost of the carbon tax to Canadians. Unfortunately they have been redacted, but it would be important I table those documents today. This is something that has been in dispute. We are getting ready to rise very soon for the summer, and Canadians need to know how much the carbon tax is going to cost.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. opposition House leader have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable on a point of order.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Mr. Speaker, during question period I asked the Prime Minister a question about the upcoming food labelling policy. I asked him whether he believed that yogourt, cheese, and fruit juice were health hazards. Based on the Prime Minister's answer, it seems clear that he had the wrong paper.

I am seeking the unanimous consent of the House to table the brief from Les Producteurs de lait du Québec, which confirms that the policy to put warning labels on the front of packaging could stigmatize a number of dairy products. I am seeking the unanimous consent of the House to inform the Prime Minister of the impact that the food labelling policy will have on milk producers.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Mégantic—L'Érable have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent is also rising on a point of order.

● (1530)

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, during question period, I did not refer to a historic event that occurred in 1971, the well-known Apollo 13. On the contrary, I was referring to a very specific document, issued in the United States, regarding Kinder Morgan's financial statements.

As all Canadians know, Kinder Morgan just received $4.5 billion in Canadian taxpayers' money for the Trans Mountain pipeline. In the first table on page 134 of that document, it states in black and white that the pipeline was assessed at $2.5 billion.

I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table this document so that Canadians are fully informed of the facts.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: I must say at this point that we are getting similar requests in successive points of order. I think it is apparent that the House is not in favour of receiving these documents.

I see the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan rising on a point of order. We will hear him now. However, I will say that we do need to get on to the business of the House.

The hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, at the moment I will not seek to table documents. I have a point of order on a totally unrelated standing order that I think is very well grounded.

An hon. member: Sit down.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Members who are asking me to sit down should listen, especially the members of PROC, who know the rules.

My good colleague from Red Deer—Lacombe gave an important point of order, and in response to it the government House leader said something like "As a member who was here until midnight last night". It is an important convention in this House not to refer to the presence or absence of members during debate. I do not know if she was referring to herself or to my good friend from Red Deer—Lacombe, but especially during late sittings, it is a grievous violation of the rules of procedure for members to make insinuations about who was or was not here late into the night. I think the government House leader should be called to order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Order.

I thank the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan for raising the issue. Of course, this does happen in the course of debate. Members from time to time will make reference to either the absence or presence of members. He is right, indeed, that it is not acceptable to do so. However, I did note that the hon. government House leader was referring to herself in that case, and we certainly recognize that members can refer to their own presence in the chamber.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL CULTURAL PROPERTY REPATRIATION ACT

The House resumed from May 30 consideration of the motion that Bill C-391, An Act respecting a national strategy for the repatriation of Aboriginal cultural property, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 3:34 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-391, under private members' business.

Call in the members.

Before the taking of the vote:

● (1550)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope, Foreign Investment; the hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith, Justice; and the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Foreign Affairs.

● (1600)

[*English*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 725)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Aldag
Allesley
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boulerice
Brassard
Breton
Brosseau
Calkins
Caron
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Doherty
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Eglinski
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Garneau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Gladu
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harder
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Kent
Khera
Kmiec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leitch
Levitt
Lloyd
Lockhart
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Nicholson
O'Regan
Paradis
Albrecht
Alghabra
Allison
Anderson
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Benzen
Bernier
Bittle
Blair
Block
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Choquette
Clement
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Deltell
Dhillon
Diotte
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Finley
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Gallant
Garrison
Genuis
Gill
Godin
Goodale
Gourde
Hardcastle
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Kusie
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Leslie
Liepert
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Motz
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Paul-Hus

Paszto	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Plamondon	Poilievre
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Rankin
Ratansi	Rayes
Reid	Richards
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rota
Rudd	Ruimy
Rusnak	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Samsoucy
Sarai	Sanya
Scarpaleggia	Schmale
Schulte	Serré
Shanahan	Sheehan
Shields	Shipley
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sopuck
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Stetski	Strahl
Stubbs	Sweet
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Tilson
Tootoo	Trost
Van Kesteren	Van Loan
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Vecchio
Viersen	Virani
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Weir
Whalen	Wilkinson
Wilson-Raybould	Wong
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 279	

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Heritage.

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee)

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I regret that I was not in the chamber while you were reading the start of the motion. I still voted, and I know that was not in order. I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to have my vote count in support of this bill.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House to record the vote of the hon. member for Chilliwack—Hope in favour?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I actually was in the lobby and heard the motion being read by you. I was actually with the government whip. My apologies to the House for missing it. I did vote. I did hear the reading of it. I believe it was counted. I also ask for unanimous consent that my vote stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

OPPORTUNITY FOR WORKERS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The House resumed from May 31 consideration of the motion that Bill C-395, An Act to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-395 under private members' business.

● (1610)

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

The Deputy Speaker: I see the hon. members for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex and Chatham-Kent—Leamington. Just one at a time.

Mr. Dave Van Kesteren: Mr. Speaker, the burden of the office, the long hours, and my age, I guess, caused a momentary lapse of judgment. My vote should read in support of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member.

The hon. member for Lambton—Kent—Middlesex.

Mr. Bev Shipley: Mr. Speaker, I remember a little while ago seeing a colleague or a friend of mine on the other side vote twice. I thought I would try it; it is wrong. So I do want my vote to count as a yes.

● (1615)

(The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 726)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Arya	Aubin
Benson	Benzen
Bergen	Bernier
Berthold	Bezan
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Block	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Brassard
Brosseau	Calkins
Cannings	Caron
Carrie	Chong
Choquette	Clarke
Clement	Cooper
Cullen	Deltell
Di Iorio	Diotte
Doherty	Donnelly
Dubé	Duvall
Eglinski	Erskine-Smith
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)	Falk (Provencher)
Fast	Finley
Gallant	Garrison
Généreux	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Hardcastle
Harder	Hughes
Jeneroux	Johns
Jolibois	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Laverdière	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd

Lobb
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Mathyssen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Quach
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Soroenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

Long
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Nantel
Nuttall
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Stetski
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer — 116

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Battle
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Dugud
Dzerowicz
El Khoury
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gill
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lockhart
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Marcil
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino

Alghabra
Amos
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Blair
Boudrias
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumiy
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Ste-Marie
Tassi
Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 167

Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Thériault
Vandal
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY ACT

The House resumed from June 1 consideration of the motion that Bill C-396, An Act to amend the Department of Industry Act (financial assistance), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-396 under private members' business.

● (1620)

(The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 727)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Aubin
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Carrie
Choquette
Clement
Cullen

Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Block
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Dehell

Diotte
Donnelly
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lavallée
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Moore
Nantel
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Reid
Samson
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer — 119

Doherty
Dubé
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kmiec
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Motz
Nicholson
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Richards
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Blair
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings

Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Bittle
Bonito
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono

Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Sweet)
Monsef
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 159

James
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

● (1625)

[*English*]

ENDANGERED WHALES

The House resumed from June 4 consideration of the motion, and of the amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment.

The question is as follows. May I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of the amendment to the House.*]

● (1635)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 728)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Aldag
Allen
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Badawey
Barlow
Beech
Bennett
Bernier
Bezan
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Choquette
Clement
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Deltell
Dhillon
Diotte
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Fast
Finley
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garneau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Godin
Goodale
Gourde
Hardcastle
Hardie
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Kmiec
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont Dundas South Glengarry)
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Massé (Avignon Le Mitis Matane Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Sweet)
Monsef
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Nuttall
O'Regan
Paradis
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rayes
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rusnak
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Saroya
Scheer
Schulte
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tassi
Tilson
Trost
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vecchio
Virani
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zimmer 273

Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Marcil 5

Nil

MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie Le Sud-Ouest Île-des-
Moore
Morin
Nantel
Nault
Nicholson
Oliver
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poilievre
Quach
Rankin
Reid
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schmale
Serré
Shanhan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sopuck
Spengemann
Stetski
Stubbs
Tan
Thériault
Tootoo
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vaughan
Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Hamilton
Gill

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment carried.

The question is on the main motion as amended. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion as amended?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion as amended will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1645)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 729)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Ablon
Allen
Amos
Anandasangaree
Ashton
Badawey
Barlow
Baylis
Beech
Bennett
Bernier
Bezan
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boudrias
Boissard
Breton
Brosseau
Calkins
Caron
Carrie
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Doherty
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Eglinski
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Falk (Provencher)
Fillmore
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gallant
Garrison
Gerretsen
Gill
Godin
Goodale
Graham
Hardcastle
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Jeneroux
Johns
Jones
Jowhari
Kent
Khera
Kmiec
Lake
Lametti
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lloyd
Lockhart
Longfield
Lukiwski
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Moore
Motz
Nantel
Nault
Nicholson
O'Regan
Paradis
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Poissant
Qualtrough
Raitt
Reid
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schmale
Serré
Sheehan
Shipley
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sopuck
Spengemann
Stetski
Stubbs
Tan
Thériault
Tootoo
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Vaughan
Garneau
Généreux
Gerretsen
Glado
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Harder
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Kelly
Khalid
Kitchen
Kusie
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Lobb
Long
Ludwig
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKenzie
Malcolmson
Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Paul-Hus
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poilievre
Quach
Rankin
Rayes
Richards
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumy
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Saroya
Scheer
Schulte
Shanahan
Shields
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tassi
Tilson
Trost
Van Loan
Vandenbeld
Vecchio

Viersen
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wilkinson
Wong
Yip
Yurdiga

Vuani
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Zimmer 278

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion, as amended, carried.

Hon. Alice Wong: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I love whales, but I do not know whether I was counted as supporting the motion. Could you check please?

The Deputy Speaker: It is good.

* * *

SUPPORTING NEW PARENTS ACT

The House resumed from June 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-394, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act (parenting tax credit), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-394 under private members' business.

● (1655)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 730)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Beaulieu
Bergen
Berthold
Block
Brassard
Carrie
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon

Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Boudrias
Calkins
Chong
Clement
Dalton
Doherty
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gill
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nuttall
Pauzé
Poilievre

Rayes
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sopuck
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Therrien
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer 91

Reid
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Abbig
Alleslev
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bayfo
Bennett
Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Csemé
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Drouin
Dubourg
Dugad
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Mahoney
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef

Aghabra
Amos
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Bossenault
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Collins
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Hébert
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Jaffer
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lavallée
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qaqish
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Stetski
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Quadeer
Rafferty
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewsky
Young — 188

PAIRED

Nil

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

CHILD HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

The House resumed from June 5 consideration of Bill S-228, An Act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (prohibiting food and beverage marketing directed at children), as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at report stage of Bill S-228 under private members' business.

● (1705)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 731)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Bronsema
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)

Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boudrias
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Chagger

Champagne
Chiang
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Di Iorio
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Ien
Jones
Joseph
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lavallée
Lebouthillier
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs)

Chen
Cormier
Csemer
Dancsoff
Dhaliwal
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite-Nation)
Leblanc
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gaspésie)
Mahoney
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)
May (Saanich — Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Monsef
Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Paul
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Qaqish
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tassi
Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewsky
Young — 197

Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Quadeer
Rafferty
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Ste-Marie
Tan
Theriault
Vandal
Vaughan
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

[redacted]

PAIRED

[redacted]

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet: Mr. Speaker, unless I am mistaken, members are not allowed to talk on the phone in the House of Commons. Since some of the members opposite are doing so, I would request that you please remind them.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Hochelaga for raising that point of order. She is right. Members should not use their cell phones to make calls. I must insist that members stop doing so.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1710)

[*English*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 2018, NO. 1

The House resumed from June 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-74, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 27, 2018 and other measures, be read the third time and passed, of the amendment and of the amendment to the amendment.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 29 the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment to the amendment to the motion at third reading stage of Bill C-74.

The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of amendment to the amendment to House*]

● (1715)

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. When you read the motion of the subamendment we are voting on now, you accurately said that I was the seconder to that motion. It was not followed by my constituency name. There being another member in the chamber with the same last name, I would not want some historian to be confused if ever they were to search the records and someone may have made an error between Ms. or Mr.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his clarification. I think I did read it, but there is no doubt at all now.

(The House divided on the amendment to the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 732)

YEAS

Members

[redacted]

NAYS

Members

[redacted]

Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Graham
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Baylis
Beech
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Soeurs)
Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Vandal
Vaughan
Wear
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tassi
Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young—200

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment defeated.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: The next question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1725)

[*English*]

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Mr. Speaker, I may have been mistakenly counted as the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge. I wonder if you could verify the record.

The Speaker: I can assure the member that has been checked and I thank him for raising it.

The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton is rising on a point of order.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Mr. Speaker, I was a bit slow getting to my feet. I wanted to verify that my vote is counting as a yes.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 733)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Berthold
Block
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Brassard

Calkins
Chong
Clement
Deltell
Doherty
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound)
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Rayes
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vandal
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 81

Carrie
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Généreux
Gladu
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nuttall
Poilievre
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Benson
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Cannings
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cullen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Donnelly
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Garrison
Gill
Goodale
Graham
Hardie
Hébert
Holland

Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Beech
Bittle
Blair
Bossio
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardcastle
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather

Hughes
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Murray
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 199

Hussen
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil

McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Moore
Mulcair
Nantel
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Plamondon
Quach
Rankin
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Stetski
Tassi
Tootoo
Vaughan
Weir
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1730)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 734)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Blair
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des Soeurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 159

Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Bittle
Bossio
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Di Iorio
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Tootoo
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Allison
Aubin
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Block
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Deltell
Doherty
Dubé
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Généreux
Gill
Godin
Hardcastle
Hughes
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Saanich — Gulf Islands)
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)
Moore
Mulcair
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sopuck
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Sweet
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer — 121

Albrecht
Anderson
Barlow
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Carrie
Choquette
Clement
Cullen
Diotte
Donnelly
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Garrison
Genuis
Gladu
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Laverdière
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Miller (Bruce — Grey — Owen Sound)
Motz
Nantel
Nuttall
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Sansoucy
Schmale
Shipley
Sorenson
Stetski
Stubbs
Thériault
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader is rising on a point of order.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's responses to five petitions.

While I am on my feet, I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (1810)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 735)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Bossio
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Bittle
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan

Routine Proceedings

Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Freeland
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Householder
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumy
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Virani
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 156

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Anderson
Barlow
Benson
Bergen
Berthold
Blaikie
Block
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Cannings
Carrie
Choquette
Cooper
Davies
Doherty
Dubé
Eglinski
Falk (Provencher)
Finley
Gallant
Allison
Aubin
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bernier
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brassard
Calkins
Caron
Chong
Clarke
Cullen
Diotte
Donnelly
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast
Fortin
Garrison

Généreux
Gladu
Hardcastle
Hughes
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lavergière
Lobb
MacGregor
Malcolmson
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Moore
Nantel
Nuttall
Pauzé
Poilievre
Rankin
Reid
Samsonoy
Schmale
Sopuck
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Kesteren
Vecchio
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Wong
Zimmer 107

Genuis
Gourde
Harder
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz
Nicholson
Paul-Hus
Plamondon
Quach
Rayes
Richards
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Sweet
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It being 6:13, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

LATIN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-218, An Act respecting Latin American Heritage Month, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

[*English*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: There is one motion in amendment standing in the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill S-218. Motion No. 1 will be debated and voted upon.

[*Translation*]

I will now put Motion No. 1 to the House.

MOTION IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill S-218 be amended by deleting the short title.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand here today and salute the contribution of Latin Americans, people from Latin American countries, and their presence in Quebec, particularly in my riding of Longueuil-Saint-Hubert. I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to thank the authors of the bill and my colleagues here in the House who are responsible for bringing this bill forward for our consideration today.

The bill before us today invites Parliament to recognize that members of the Latin American community in Canada have made an invaluable contribution to Canada's social, economic, and political fabric. Designating a Latin American heritage month will allow Canadians to learn more about this contribution and ensure that it is never forgotten.

The bill also notes that Latin American communities from across the country would take advantage of Latin American heritage month to celebrate and share their unique culture and traditions with all Canadians.

What is more, the bill notes that October is an especially important month for Latin American communities the world over. It would designate October as Latin American heritage month across Canada.

This bill talks about the diversity of Latin American communities in Quebec and Canada from diverse countries and states and their significant contribution to the broader communities around them, to community spirit, the economy of our towns and villages, and to the social fabric of our country. The presence of these communities with which Quebeckers share a certain affinity, similar values and culture, and where—

● (1815)

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Order. I would ask the members who are having conversations to please take them out of the chamber. The House is in session, and we are having a debate here.

The hon. member for Longueuil—Saint-Hubert.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel: Madam Speaker, I note that this bill mentions the diversity of Latin American communities in Quebec and Canada, since Latin Americans come from various countries and states, and the important contributions they have made to the broader communities around them, to community spirit, to the economy of our cities and towns, and to the social fabric of our country. The presence of communities with which Quebeckers share a certain affinity, similar values and culture, and where there is mutual recognition, contributes a great deal to our communities, and that is what I want to acknowledge about this bill.

Quebec's intercultural project is based on this ability to live together and work together to build a community. This involves recognizing our shared values and the contributions of every individual, which are shaped by his or her personal experience and cultural background.

It is also the reason why this bill proposes that Quebeckers and Canadians learn more about the contributions of Latin American Canadians, to provide an opportunity to remember and recognize them. That is what designating a Latin American heritage month would do. It would allow us to learn about the achievements of Latin American Canadians in communities throughout Quebec, particularly in our own neighbourhoods, like Longueuil and Saint-Hubert, where I live. The same holds true in communities across Canada that have been enriched by the contributions of people from many different backgrounds.

There is a reason why October has been proposed for Latin American heritage month. As mentioned in the bill, October is an important month for Latin Americans. Fall is a time when many Latin American countries, including Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Chile, celebrate their independence.

Many of these countries were among the first former colonies to declare independence in the 19th century, and some became models of republican harmony. They projected the idea that racial segregation could be consigned to the dustbin of history, along with colonial institutions and economic exploitation.

There are other reasons why this bill proposes making October a month for celebrating Latin American communities. October was chosen because of certain traditions and customs. We know that it is a significant month in Latin America and South America, since it is the month when Costa Rica celebrates the Day of Cultures, Venezuela observes the Day of Indigenous Resistance, Argentina marks the Day of Respect for Cultural Diversity, Brazil has its Children's Day, and various Latin American cultures celebrate the Day of the Dead.

We feel that dedicating the 10th month of the year to our Latin American communities would give members of those communities an opportunity to share these cultural traditions with their neighbours. The bill also notes that this event would bring people together and give them a chance to share and celebrate this rich cultural heritage.

A little while ago, *L'Actualité* published a profile of Quebec's Latin American community that highlighted the strong kinship between Quebeckers and the tens of thousands of members of that community, who often refer to themselves as Latino-Quebeckers. According to the article, 90% of Latino immigrants choose to learn French when they settle in Quebec. The community has a political presence in Quebec too, with people like former minister Joseph Facal and the member for Honoré-Mercier, who is originally from Argentina.

Our cities bear witness to the political history of these peoples. The statue of Simón Bolívar located five minutes from here, just off Rideau Street, was a gift to Canada from Venezuela, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru. We also have Salvador Allende Street in Laval, a tribute to the former Chilean president who was assassinated in a coup d'état. Let us not forget Quebec City's Parc de l'Amérique-Latine at the mouth of the Saint-Charles River, which pays tribute to great figures in Latin American History, such as poet, writer, and Cuban national independence hero José Martí, Haitian independence hero Toussaint Louverture, and military leader Bernardo O'Higgins, a hero who fought for Chilean independence.

However, those who have left the most indelible mark on Quebec are the men and women who made a life here. Thousands of people from various Latin and South American countries now live in Quebec City, Gatineau, Sherbrooke, and the area I am from, Longueuil and Saint-Hubert.

At the Nouvelle Vie church in Longueuil, there are Venezuelan, Peruvian, Cuban, and Quebec musicians. The Sacré-Coeur-de-Jésus church on Brodeur Street hosts colourful family celebrations.

Since I was elected in 2011, one of the encounters that stood out for me was the one with Marco Carpinteyro, who has worked with the Table Itinérance Rive-Sud for many years and who, to me, is one of the greatest examples of community involvement. Although Marco does a lot of work in the community, and everyone back home in Longueuil agrees, I am sure that if you asked him what he is most proud of, he would say his children. He teaches them about his heritage every day, since the most beautiful language of all is the one spoken by our children.

● (1820)

It is in our best interests to actively create stronger relationships with Latin American countries, to build cultural bridges, and to share our ambitions with trade blocs like Mercosur. The Latin American communities established here, in Quebec and Canada, can help facilitate these joint projects. These communities and their heritage also make unique contributions to our culture and to the spirit of community in Quebec.

I am very proud to highlight these contributions today and to support this proposal to designate a Latin American heritage month that we can celebrate in all of our communities every year.

* * *

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a very quick point of order.

I rise to respond to a point of order raised earlier today by the hon. member for Red Deer—Lacombe with respect to the notice of time allocation given on Bill C-59 yesterday evening.

I would like to offer that *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 673, states:

> In the case of a bill referred to committee before second reading, the motion can pertain to both the report stage and second reading stage as well as the third reading stage. The amount of time allocated for any stage may not be less than one sitting day or its equivalent in hours.

A good example of this was when the previous Parliament, on May 28, 2015, adopted a motion for time allocation at report stage and second reading stage and at the third reading stage, as referenced in footnote 142 on page 673 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

As such, I would argue that the notice is indeed in order.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I appreciate the additional information and can indicate, as well, that I was in the House yesterday when the government House leader actually did clarify her motion. Resuming debate.

* * *

[*English*]

LATIN AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill S-218, An Act respecting Latin American Heritage Month, as reported (without amendment) from the committee, and of the motion in Group No. 1.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is a delight to speak in the House tonight about Bill S-218, an act respecting Latin American heritage month.

I want to honour the memory of the hon. Senator Tobias Enverga, who first brought the bill forward in the Senate. The senator passed away recently, which was a real shock to everyone. He was loved by all, and he was considerate of all.

It is important to note that the reason Senator Enverga brought the bill forward was that he noticed that there were other heritage days. There was German heritage day, Italian heritage day, and Asian heritage day. There is nothing wrong with that, but he felt it was important, with 500,000 Latin American Canadians living in Canada and contributing richly to our society, that we honour them as well with a special heritage month.

There are those who get tired of the different days, weeks, and months we have. They feel that perhaps they all become less special when there are so many of them. However, I think that is because we, as parliamentarians, are more aware of them. We come every day to the House and there are ribbons to wear for a certain occasion, or a flower of some sort, or some little thing. We are aware of all the days we celebrate different events, but not everyone is aware of them. The Latin American community in Canada, and people who enjoy the Latin American community, will be very happy to share in this month.

I thought I would give the House a bit of exposure to Latin American culture through my eyes as I have travelled around the world. My first experience with Latin American culture was in Colombia. I decided, when I was 25, that I was going to take a trip and experience the world. I went to a small village in Colombia. I loved the people immediately. I was at a resort. I was taught to dance. The Latin American people are well known for their excellent dancing. Their dance moves are incredibly stylish, and the men just seem to know how to dance. In fact, it is alleged that the government whip is an incredibly good dancer. I have not seen it myself, but I would not be surprised, because the Latin American people are great dancers.

Because I learned to dance, when I returned, I would go to Toronto to a salsa club there, and the Latin American crowd would be there. It was such a festive environment.

That was my first exposure.

One of the others things I loved was the food I experienced. When I travelled globally for Dow Chemical, I went to Argentina, Chile, Brazil, and all over the place, and I really experienced different cuisine. I also spent quite a bit of time in Mexico. I absolutely love Mexican food.

Some of the rich experiences I had were with the way they put on their meals. The people in Brazil have a tradition called churrascaria. It is a dinner where they bring a lot meat. The meat comes on long swords, and people are given paddles with a green side and a red side. If people want the meat to keep coming, they keep the green side up. When they want the meat to stop coming, they turn the red side up. It is amazing. There are different cuts. It is very enjoyable cuisine, and the experience was very special.

The cuisine in Mexico was mostly good, although I did have a couple of experiences with the local specialities of ant eggs and crickets, which I ate, but I would not include it in what I consider to be fine Latin American cuisine.

I also experienced the work ethic of the Latin American people, which is excellent. With Dow, I was in charge of quality globally. I had the opportunity to do an audit in Brazil. I have audited all over the world, and I have found things amiss or not correctly done. In Brazil, I was amazed. Everyone was doing their jobs, everyone was following procedures, and there were no defects to be found. I said, in surprise, to one of my Brazilian counterparts that everyone was doing everything they were supposed to do. He said, "Of course they are, because if they don't, they are fired." The discipline, the work ethic, of the Latin American people is something to be admired. Their productivity should be as well.

From an employee satisfaction point of view, in every plant Dow had in a Latin American community they were the happiest people and the most productive people.

● (1825)

I have had involvement in a number of other countries and different experiences. I was involved in a mission trip to Nicaragua and was exposed to the people there, and even the ones who are living in a lot of poverty are so loving and hospitable. They have such a passion for life, family, and God. I really embrace those values. The people who have come to Sarnia—Lambton from a Latin American community have brought those values with them to the community. There are more Latin Americans living in Ontario and Quebec than in the rest of the country, so we are more fortunate. However, I know that people across Canada will be able to experience the culture of those people and the love they have for our country. They are fiercely loyal and patriotic, and having a month to celebrate them makes a lot of sense.

This bill picks October because of the celebrations that go on in different countries during that month. For example, there is *Día de las Culturas*, the day of the cultures, in Costa Rica; *Día de la Resistencia Indígena*, the day of indigenous resistance, in Venezuela; *Día del Respeto a la Diversidad Cultural*, the day of respect for cultural diversity, in Argentina; *Día de las Américas*, the day of the Americas, in Uruguay; and, in Brazil, the feast day of Our Lady of Aparecida and *Día das Crianças*, children's day. Puerto Rico and Chile also wrap up their independence celebrations in October, and many countries, such as Mexico, end October with a three-day celebration called *Día de los Muertos*, the Day of the Dead, a celebration of their ancestors. That is why we are picking October for this month.

I am not exactly sure why the party to the left decided that it wanted to remove the short title. I think the short title, "Latin American Heritage Month" is fine. It describes exactly what it is.

I want to give some information about the different countries that make up the Latin American public, just in case people do not know. We talked about Mexico and Columbia already. El Salvador is on the list, as well as Peru, Brazil, Chile, Venezuela, Argentina, Cuba, Guatemala, Ecuador, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Honduras, Paraguay, Uruguay, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Panama, and Puerto Rico. A lot of those countries I have not yet been to, so there are a lot of Latin American experiences I can have globally, and I still have years to do that.

Meanwhile, everybody should embrace the Latin Americans who have come to Canada. Everyone in the House should support this bill. We will have a lot of fun celebrating Latin American heritage month. I am sure the food will be good. I am sure the dancing will be good. I am not sure I will be dancing very well. There are YouTube videos out there that show me trying to do a tango to Madonna's *Material Girl*, but I will leave that for people to find.

We could honour the people by recognizing the contribution they have made in helping to build our country and our communities, and bringing that passion for love, life, family, and God to our country.

I am going to wrap up by saying again that I appreciate Senator Tobias Enverga's bringing this bill forward in the Senate. I appreciate the member for Thornhill being the sponsor here in the House and paying this the attention it deserves. I am pleased that this would join the many other heritage days we have, such as German Heritage Month, Asian Heritage Month, Italian Heritage Month, and all the other days, months, and weeks we celebrate in the House. It is something worth celebrating, and I will be very proud to enjoy all the cuisine, the dancing, and the passion on those days.

● (1830)

Mr. Arif Virani (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage (Multiculturalism), Lib.): Madam Speaker, *gracias* and *obrigado*. I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill S-218, an act respecting Latin American heritage month. This bill recognizes the contributions of the Latin American community to Canada and seeks to establish the month of October as Latin American heritage month.

Canadians of Latin American origin have been foundational in communities across our country going back to the early 1970s. The government supports Bill S-218 as a meaningful way to reflect on and celebrate the significant contributions that Latin American Canadians have made, and continue to make, to the social, economic, and political fabric of this country. It also gives a unique opportunity for all Canadians to celebrate Latin American culture and its traditions.

[*Translation*]

Before going into further details about the important contributions of this community to Canadian society, let me begin by outlining the principles that support the fabric of Canada.

[*English*]

As was stated in the 2015 Speech from the Throne:

> As a country, we are strengthened in many ways: by our shared experiences, by the diversity that inspires both Canada and the world, and by the way that we treat each other.

Given the strong and growing presence of individuals of Latin American ancestry, formal recognition of Latin American heritage month will provide us with a terrific opportunity to recognize the contribution of this community in celebration of our diversity and our inclusive society here in Canada.

It is important to note that the term "Latin American" can be used to refer to communities from the parts of the Americas where Spanish or Portuguese is the main language, and it refers to all people originating from the geographic area of Latin America. This includes Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking communities, as well as francophone communities and the indigenous peoples of the region.

The "Latin American" reference was the one preferred by the late Senator Tobias Enverga, who introduced Bill S-218 in the Senate in 2016. We thank him for that contribution to Canadian parliamentary business and for the legacy he is leaving with this bill. Senator Enverga explained that he consulted members of the communities and the public and gave consideration to taking on a more inclusive framing or terminology to the commemoration.

That is why the bill refers to "Latin America", which includes Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela, as well as Puerto Rico, the French West Indies, and other islands.

● (1835)

[*Translation*]

As we all know, immigration has played, and will continue to play, a key role in the development of our country. Canada offers a way of life that attracts thousands of newcomers every year.

[*English*]

The first wave of Latin American immigrants arrived in Canada in the early 1970s, with the arrival of about 68,000 people.

I will digress for a moment to say that I personally had the privilege to work with dozens of persons of Latin American heritage as a young student in 1995, in my first year of law school at the University of Toronto. As a law student, I was working with an entity called the Centre for Spanish-Speaking Peoples, on Bathurst Street, just south of Dupont in downtown Toronto. The CSSP was a small clinic, but it was vital for Latin Americans, primarily refugee applicants, who confronted challenges with navigating the legal system and our immigration laws. That experience was extremely formative for me in many ways, not just in terms of my development and training as a young lawyer, but also in terms of my knowledge, understanding, and exposure to Latino culture.

Canadians of Latin American heritage continue to make major contributions to Canadian society in ways that build a strong and prosperous nation. Noting this continued credit to Canada, let me say a few words about some prominent Canadians of Latin American heritage.

[*Translation*]

In terms of academics, Professor Alejandro Adem, a Latin American Canadian of Mexican descent, has made important contributions to the field of mathematics. Professor Adem has been a professor in the department of mathematics at the University of British Columbia since 2005 and holds a Canada Research Chair. He is currently the CEO and scientific director of Mitacs, Canada.

With respect to sport, Mauro Biello, born in Montreal and of Latin American heritage, was the head coach and director of player personnel for the Montreal Impact professional soccer team for eight years. Prior to joining the Impact's coaching staff, Mr. Biello had a 19-year professional playing career, including 16 seasons in Montreal. In 389 career games played with the Montreal Impact, Mr. Biello scored 77 goals and 67 assists for 221 points during the regular season, playoffs and championship games.

[*English*]

I would note for the record that I have had the pleasure of personally observing the passion of the Latin American community for football in the city of Montreal, when I watched a match with a colleague, the member for LaSalle—Émard—Verdun. We watched the Toronto team, TFC, take on Montreal Impact two years ago during the elimination matches. Although, as the member for Parkdale—High Park, I was cheering for my local squad, I was extremely impressed with the engagement of the 60,000 people who filled the Big O in Montreal for that match. The passion they showed for those players, many of whom were Latin American, was palpable.

I could go on and on about the contributions of Latin Americans to the sport and to the beautiful game. One need only think of the Spaniards, their European championships in 2008 and 2012, and their victory in Mondial 2010. We think of Cristiano Ronaldo and the Portuguese victory in 2016. There is Lionel Messi, from Argentina. As a specific fan of No. 10 for the Argentinian squad and for FC Barcelona, of course I need to recognize the significant contributions of Messi. The list of contributions of Latin Americans to athleticism, culture, and academics goes on and on.

Over the years, Latin American communities have brought their rich and vibrant culture to our country. Several Spanish-language newspapers, magazines, and newsletters are published in Canada, such as the Toronto-based El Popular. Theatre presentations, poetry recitals, and art exhibitions are common in larger communities, such as those across the city of Toronto, including Parkdale—High Park, where we have a strong and vibrant Latin American community. Indeed, dance and music groups are active throughout Canada and throughout our urban centres. Latin American writers, poets, painters, singers, chefs, and journalists have become well known in Canada.

I would be remiss not to mention the reference that was made to the chief government whip and the contributions of Latin American culture to the fine art of dance. I, too, appreciate the finer aspects of Latin American dance. It is with great pride that I declare that I, in fact, met my wife at a salsa class, so clearly Latin American culture brings people together. This August, we will have been married for 13 years.

Different groups, associations, and festivals promote and share Latin American culture in major Canadian cities, such as Toronto, which has been recognized as the most multicultural city on the planet. For example, Latin American-Canadian Art Projects is a Toronto-based not-for-profit arts organization dedicated to the implementation of arts projects, promoting Latin American art in Canada with an emphasis on artistic excellence.

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

The Confédération des associations latino-américaines de Québec, a not-for-profit organization, supports members of the Latin American community in the Québec City area and organizes various cultural activities. I could name many other examples in other parts of the country. Canada is recognized worldwide for its successful approach to multiculturalism. We are succeeding culturally, politically, and economically because of our diversity.

[*English*]

Let me reinforce the fact that Canada's multicultural heritage and identity are more than just a commitment to welcoming diverse people from around the world. It is a commitment to the principles of equality and freedom, grounded in human rights and enshrined in the Canadian Constitution and the Multiculturalism Act. That act's predecessor was the adoption of multiculturalism policy by Pierre Elliott Trudeau in 1971, a gesture whose statutory manifestation, the Multiculturalism Act, is celebrating its 30th anniversary this year. What better year to declare October Latin American heritage month in Canada to celebrate that community and its vast contributions in Canada toward diversity, which is truly our greatest strength.

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC):

[*Member spoke in Spanish*]

[*English*]

Madam Speaker, this is yet another opportunity to talk about Latin American heritage month and Bill S-218. Let me acknowledge again the support this bill has received from all sides of the House since it arrived here from the Senate.

This legislation essentially recognizes the many significant contributions to Canada's social, economic, cultural, and political fabric made by Canada's dynamic Latin American community. As I have done on every occasion I have spoken to the bill, I would like to again remind colleagues and those watching on CPAC tonight that this legislation, carefully fashioned by our late colleague, the hon. Senator Tobias Enverga, will I am sure stand as a notable element of his political legacy.

In a moment I will speak of my admiration and unrestrained support for the bill, but first I would like to read just a couple of paragraphs from a speech delivered by Senator Enverga when he spoke at second reading in the other place.

He reminded his colleague that he came to Canada from the Philippines and that he was one of many people now in the Senate who were fortunate enough to be welcomed to Parliament, and to be able to contribute to society. Senator Tobias Enverga pointed out that, "Few countries in the world are as open and accepting to people who come from other countries to settle and make a new life for themselves." He said, "The Canadian policy of multiculturalism is a great success when it comes to allowing for, and celebrating, the various cultural backgrounds and languages we have", and share.

The Senator referenced other heritage months that moved him to propose one for Canadians of Latin American descent. He talked about the importance of Black History Month, proclaimed in 1995, and about Asian Heritage Month. He anticipated Italian Heritage Month and Portuguese Heritage Month, both passed into law just last year, and this year we celebrated Jewish Heritage Month.

Before I get to the bill he created, the process and legislation before us today, I will provide a little background on this great Canadian.

Tobias "Jun" Enverga was respected by all for his kindness, warm sense of humour, and his unparalleled work ethic. He was a family man, self-described as surrounded by four lovely women, his daughters Reeza, Rocel, and Rystle, and his wife Rosemer. He was a tireless advocate for people with disabilities. Tobias served as a Catholic School Board trustee in Toronto for years and became known in the Toronto region for launching the Philippine Canadian Charitable Foundation and its fantastic annual Pinoy festival and trade show, which, by the way, is next Saturday at the Toronto Convention Centre. Senator Enverga was also co-chair of the Canada-Philippines Interparliamentary Group, and inaugurated the annual Filipino independence day flag raising on Parliament Hill, which I am sure many members of the House will attend on Monday morning.

During his years at the Senate, Senator Enverga was a member of several standing committees. He participated in a variety of important studies on issues ranging from first nations northern housing to maritime search and rescue operations. Also, and this is very important to remember, Senator Enverga was an executive member of the ParlAmericas group. He invested his energy in forging closer ties with parliamentarians from across Latin America, helping them to strengthen democracy and governance in their countries through political dialogue and parliamentary co-operation. It was his work with ParlAmericas that moved him to propose the bill before us today.

As we know all too well, Senator Enverga passed away Thursday, November 16, while on parliamentary business in Colombia. Despite his tragic and untimely passing, Senator Enverga's Latin American heritage month bill lives on. It was passed in the other place a couple of weeks later and sent to us in the House.

● (1845)

Some of my colleagues in the House may remember that Senator Enverga introduced a bill in the 41st Parliament, Bill S-228, to create a Hispanic heritage month, matching such designations by the Province of Ontario and the City of Toronto. However, that bill was lost on the Order Paper in the election of 2015.

Senator Enverga, after further consultation with members of the public, reconsidered the reintroduction of that legislation and decided instead to change the focus in this bill to "Latin American", as a geographic and linguistic community, which adds not only the Lusophone and Francophone communities, but also those of the indigenous peoples of the Latin American region. This was not a snap decision. Senator Enverga pondered long and deeply the issues of self-identification of the diverse Latin American community in Canada. He became convinced that a Latin American heritage month would better enhance our understanding of the complexities involved and believed this act would better respect the spirit of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988.

Latin America is of our hemisphere. The region is generally understood to consist of the entire continent of South America, all of Central America, Mexico, and the islands of the Caribbean whose peoples speak a Romance language or have a Romance language among their various official languages.

For the purposes of this bill, Senator Enverga envisioned the widest possible interpretation so Bill S-218 would cover those who identified as Spanish and Portuguese speakers from South America and Central America, as well as those whose heritage was of the Francophone and Hispanic Caribbean Islands.

Using that broad and inclusive measure, we can see that Canadians of Latin American origin can be found far and wide across our great country from coast to coast to coast. In the absence of absolute census numbers covering that broad, and I think members would agree somewhat imprecise measure, we might estimate a possible demographic well above half a million men, women and children.

What we do know is that the Latin American community is one of the fastest-growing cultural groups in Canada today. Statistics Canada reports that between 1996 and 2001, for example, the number of individuals reporting Latin American origins rose by 32%, at a time when the overall Canadian population grew by only 4%.

With respect to actual numbers, the demographers can only estimate that between 600,000 and 1.2 million Latin Americans, again from the broadest possible measure, live among us. These numbers are particularly interesting, given there was only a small Latin American population in Canada before the 1960s. It was in the sixties and seventies that we recorded the first significant migration of Latin Americans to Canada. Unfortunately, in too many cases, their motivation was to escape social and economic turmoil, dictatorships, conflict, and most recently another wave, fleeing Venezuela's corrupt and repressive regimes under, first, Hugo Chavez, and now the brutal Nicolas Maduro. These Latin Americans represented significant loss to the countries they left, but they have been a boon to Canada.

I could speak to the virtues of supporting Bill S-218, a bill to bring Latin American Heritage Month to Canada, but I must stop there. I move:

> That, when the order for consideration of Bill S-218, an Act respecting Latin American Heritage Month is next called, the time provided for the consideration of any remaining stage of the bill be extended, pursuant to Standing Order 98(3), by a period not exceeding five consecutive hours.

● (1850)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please rise.

And 20 or more members having risen:

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): More than 20 members having risen the motion is adopted.

(Motion agreed to)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Resuming debate, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak about the legislation before us, for two reasons. One of the strong messages that our Prime Minister sends to all regions of our country is how proud we are of Canada's diversity and all the benefits that are derived from it. No matter where we go in Canada, we see a great number of people with such diversity and appreciation for what we are as a nation. We are a multicultural nation with a great sense of pride in our diversity.

Before I comment on the legislation, I want to speak about Senator Enverga. I knew Senator Enverga in my capacity as a co-chair. He and I were co-chairs of the Philippines-Canada Friendship Group, and we were able to accomplish a great deal. In fact, shortly after the friendship group was formed, Senator Enverga was appointed to the Senate. Shortly after being appointed to the Senate, he and I had the opportunity to meet and talk about the Philippines. He had values that many of us share, a passion and love for the Philippines and the desire for a healthier relationship between Canada and the Philippines.

My friend across the way referred to another issue that Senator Enverga was behind, and that was the flag-raising ceremony. In fact, this Monday, at 11 o'clock on the steps of Parliament, there will be a flag-raising ceremony, and I suspect there will be a few tributes to Senator Enverga.

As the current chair of the Philippines-Canada Friendship Group, I would be wrong not to mention that we will see all members of the House, members of the Filipino community, and others participating in that activity. Then at one o'clock in the Commonwealth Room, special guests will be talking about the importance of the very special and unique relationship between Canada and the Philippines. I invite all members to participate.

That said, we are having a wonderful debate on a very important community, and no one more is more engaged than the government whip, who is full of passion for anything Latino. The government whip is a very proud individual and has worn the Philippines' colours on his shoulders on many different occasions. Others in the chamber have also made reference to the Latino factor that the government whip carries with him wherever he goes.

I will now get back to diversity. As the Prime Minister has often said, diversity is one of Canada's greatest strengths, and we need to celebrate that. Recognizing Latin America heritage month in the month of October would do all sorts of wonderful things. It would provide members in the House, members in the other place, and anyone who has an interest in promoting the contributions of Latin America and the countries that make up Latin America with the opportunity to share that wealth of culture, whether it is festivities, clothing, foods, their hard-working attitude, or the many contributions made by our Latin American community. It is a community that continues to grow in great numbers in Canada today, and I believe that community will continue to grow.

Focusing on Winnipeg, I am a big advocate of Folklorama, a two-week celebration of Canada's diversity. There will be performances in a number of pavilions. It is worth noting that it is not easy for these pavilions, because they are open seven days a week and run by volunteers. There will be all sorts of cultural displays, dances, food, and an overall super-fantastic time. One gets to explore the world by participating in Folklorama.

● (1855)

I did a quick guided tour of the Folklorama website while I was listening to my colleagues across the way. Members will be very happy to hear that there are four easily identifiable pavilions, and I will share some of the comments.

For example, the website shows the Brazilian Pavilion, and says:

> Come out and see our high energy show! Live music coupled with live entertainment will take you on a tour of Brasil. Relax in air-conditioned comfort as you sample the tasty cuisine and cultural beverages of Brasil. Cachaça cocktails and Brazilian beer will have you feeling like you are a heartbeat away from the amazing Brazilian beaches, while our nonalcoholic drinks will refresh your taste buds. The fun never stops and you can enjoy yourself late into the night during our Friday late night party! For Saturday, there might not be a late night party, but don't worry we will be holding a late night show!

However, this is not the only Latin American pavilion. We have two solid weeks. In the first week, we will have two pavilions from Latin America, and the following week two demonstrations on Latin America. For example, the website shows the Chilean Pavilion, and says:

Head into the warm embrace of the Chilean people as you experience food, drink, and dances from the various regions of Chile, including the north-central, south and Easter Island. Enjoy the lively Latin stylings of our own "QUIDEL" dance group, as well as long-time performers, Chile Lucha y Canta. Be sure to try a Chilean favourite: borgoña, a drink made with cold red wine and strawberries. Then dance the night away at our late night parties on Friday and Saturday, complete with live music from local band Descarga Latina!

Folklorama is a celebration that takes place every year in Winnipeg, and will get 200,000 visits. It encompasses a large number of volunteers. This is why I think it is important that we have these heritage months. People should be proud of their heritage and their homeland countries. When we see the celebrations of people from countries all over the world, we are the better for it.

I mentioned two of the four pavilions. However, the hours dedicated to this are not just to put together a pavilion during Folklorama, but also for other activities virtually year round. We have young people engaged in their culture and the heritage of their homeland and are sharing it with others year round. This is why, when I think of having a Latin America heritage month, it is more than just an opportunity for MPs and senators to go out and promote, but, more importantly, it is for all individuals to have an opportunity to explore all the things they can do in the month of October.

For example, if one is a school teacher in a junior high or high school, it provides an opportunity to recognize the contributions of Latin America. October would be the month recognized by Parliament as Latin American heritage month, and teachers could take advantage of it by organizing a lunch program or after-school program and invite community members out. It is a wonderful thing that can really promote what makes Canada great.

This is our diversity, and we need to be proud of our heritage. Our Canadian heritage is made up of people from countries around the world. I, for one, am a very proud Canadian.

● (1900)

Mrs. Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am very happy to rise today in support of this bill.

[*Member spoke in Spanish*]

[*English*]

It is great to be here tonight. I am certainly very much a lover of Latin America, having spent much time there and really having grown to love not only the region but the Latin American people as well. It is a rich culture that I enjoy very much.

I am fortunate to have had the opportunity to travel with my family to different countries in Latin America when I was growing up. However, how I really got to know Latin America as a diplomat in the Canadian foreign service. I was very fortunate to have postings across Latin America. I had a posting in Buenos Aires, a very beautiful city in Argentina. It is truly like the Paris of the south. During that time I had a lovely apartment in a region called Recoleta. I had a lovely opportunity to take tango lessons and to view the beautiful museums there. I should add that I am a fan of Evita Perón, so it was very good to get to know one of my political idols during that period of time as well.

I went on to become the chargé d'affaires in El Salvador, in San Salvador, for two years. What a beautiful nation it is, in terms of the volcanoes, the beaches, the ruins. I very much got to know and love the people, despite the many challenges there: the gang violence, the drug trafficking. These are very challenging things, but I felt very proud of the work I was doing as a Canadian diplomat to combat these things. I sat through many earthquakes, measuring four or six on the Richter scale. It is very uncomfortable and unnerving, but something that we became accustomed to living in Latin America.

I was also very fortunate to serve for one year as a policy adviser to the member for Thornhill, who of course is a major part of this bill here today. We had an incredible experience as a team working with Canadians in relation to Latin America. We have some very fond memories together. I remember in 2009 going to Honduras in an effort to negotiate the end of a coup with the Organization of American States at the time. I remember flying there and being whisked through what was a very high-security environment at the time. We really were in lockdown as we worked on behalf of Canada, but also for the Latin American people, to try to help them go down the path of democracy. That is something I have always welcomed, with the previous Harper government. I follow Jason Kenney in my riding, but certainly there were others. There were John Baird and Prime Minister Harper himself, who were very big supporters of democracy in the Americas. I was very pleased to serve under the former minister of state for the Americas in this capacity. It truly was an honour and a privilege.

I have always enjoyed the warmth of the Latin American people. They are incredibly *chaleureux*. They will always welcome people into their home, be it with a pupusa in El Salvador or a wonderful steak and a nice malbec in Argentina. They are very warm people, and yet I also appreciate the formality in Latin America. Latin America is a place where history and culture are very important, and institutions that are very important for Conservatives such as the family, the church, and these things. I have always felt a very strong affinity for this region and its people.

● (1905)

Of course, I am very sad to say that there are certainly some challenges faced in the Americas. They are no stranger to oppressive regimes, having lived under several dictators. I think, for example, of Pinochet in Chile who was in power for years. As well, in El Salvador, where I served, they struggled with civil war. I was very fortunate to be there in 2007, celebrating the 15-year end of the El Salvadoran civil war. That was something very special during my time there. I am very fortunate to have had these incredible experiences.

Unfortunately, we are still seeing lingering problems with democracy in Latin America to this day. I remember, during my time in the minister of state of the Americas office, monitoring ALBA and the Bolivarians.

Very recently we have seen the terrible happenings in Venezuela with the oppressive regime there, and the elections, which of course are not at all valid by our democratic standards. They certainly causes concern for us as Canadians. More recently, Nicaragua is getting to a point that is very concerning, which I hope the government will speak out on, as they have with Venezuela.

That is a big part of what this bill is about, supporting the ideas of democracy, justice, free markets, all of these principles that we, in the Harper government, supported so very strongly and will continue to support and promote, not only in Latin America but around the world as well.

I do have some concerns about the historic actions of the government, in particular the words of condolence by the Prime Minister at the death of Castro, which to me, unfortunately, seems to speak of support for a communist regime. I know that as a Conservative government, we were always in absolute support of the dissidents.

As a policy adviser, I continually looked for ways for us to be a mediator. Indeed, 2008 to 2009 was a very exciting time to work with the minister of state for the Americas because it was during the Obama era and we were looking at the Helms-Burton Act being re-opened and at both missions being re-evaluated. We were looking at visitation rights for Latin American people in America being revisited too.

The relationship between Canada and the Americas always been very dear to me. I will say again that the principles that Conservatives stand for as the official opposition are democracy, justice, the rule of law, and free markets. We will continue to support these things in Latin America. We would encourage the government to do the same, as well.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize all the wonderful new Canadians that Latin America has given to us. I am very fortunate to have many of them, both in my riding of Calgary Midnapore, as well as the city of Calgary. These new Canadians from Latin America have been a major force in the oil and gas sector. Latin America really has given us some of their best and brightest, in terms of engineers, geophysicists, and these types. I have a statistic here that as of 2016, Latin Americans in Canada numbered close to half a million, or some 447,000.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that I love Latin America, I love Canada, and I see no reason why we should not all support a Latin American heritage month.

● (1910)

[*Member spoke in Spanish*]

The Deputy Speaker: The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired, and the item is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACT

BILL C-69—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.) moved:

> That in relation to Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and five hours shall be allotted to the consideration at third reading stage of the said bill; and
>
> That, at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration of report stage and at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration of the third reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

● (1915)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period.

[*English*]

I invite hon. members who may wish to participate in asking questions to rise in their place so that the Chair has some measure of the number of members who wish to participate in the 30-minute question period.

We will ask hon. members to keep their interventions to about one minute, and similarly the minister responding to keep responses to approximately one minute. As members know, during this 30-minute question time, favour is generally given to opposition members, but certainly not to the exclusion of members who sit on the government side.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the environment committee who has been involved in the discussion and debate on Bill C-69, I have never been so appalled in my entire life at how bad this particular bill is.

For example, Chris Bloomer, the president of the Canadian Energy Pipeline Association, likened Canada's regulatory environment to a toxic regulatory environment.

Recently Don Lowry, past president and CEO of Epcor Utilities, wrote a piece in the *Edmonton Journal* on June 5:

> Investor flight from energy sector is a national embarrassment
>
> Over the last few years, a thicket of regulatory approvals and processes, both provincial and federal, have crept into place, effectively suffocating through delay and denial anything getting timely approval.

As someone with an environmental background who has worked in pipeline assessments, I can assure the minister that every single pipeline in Canada is built to the highest environmental standards.

Why is the minister piling unnecessary regulations on the Canadian energy sector and denying Canadians the economic opportunity that they need to build this country?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member and all members of the committee for their very thorough review of Bill C-69 and the many thoughtful amendments.

The committee heard from over 80 witnesses and reviewed over 150 submissions over two months, and the quality and scope of the amendments speak to the rigour with which they reviewed the bill. I am very pleased to say our government is supporting these amendments.

We need to do better. Canadians elected us because they wanted to make sure we demonstrated that the environment and the economy go hand in hand. With Bill C-69, we know we needed to rebuild trust that was sorely lacking because of the Conservatives' actions in gutting our environmental assessment process, so I am very pleased that we have come together and are going to be able to rebuild trust, because it is so critical that we get good projects going ahead after a thorough environmental assessment.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, here we go again with time allocation.

Now that I have the minister in the House, I have a question for her. Last week the minister and her government voted in support of Bill C-262, an act to ensure that the laws of Canada are in harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The member for Edmonton Strathcona moved roughly 25 amendments at committee to make sure that this bill actually lives up to what the Liberals did last week, and every single amendment was voted down by the Liberals. She now has several motions at report stage that seek to bring this bill in harmony with the UNDRIP.

Will the minister be consistent with her vote last week and support these amendments to make sure that Bill C-69 lives up to the provisions of what she voted for in voting in favour of Bill C-262, yes or no?

● (1920)

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to talk about Bill C-69. While we might not always agree on every point, it is important to note that the committee passed a number of opposition amendments and there were a significant number that received unanimous support. I would like to highlight some of those.

There was a key amendment proposed by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands that was supported by committee members. It clearly reflected the government's strong commitment to science, and it was clearly very important. Liberal members also took into account NDP amendments in drafting the amendments. The member opposite spoke about reflecting the importance of the UNDRIP. That was really key.

Many amendments in relation to indigenous peoples were passed. This bills clarifies that indigenous knowledge would be considered and would not be limited to traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples. A number of amendments would strengthen the protection of indigenous knowledge. We know this is very important to indigenous peoples.

There were many other amendments that I am sure I will have the chance to talk about.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister talked about the quality of amendments. They were not put in to strengthen the rigour; they are there to try to clean up the mess that this bill is, and everybody understands that.

I was part of the natural resources file in the past and I am familiar with the past energy assessment legislation. What we needed was less interference, not more, but the government has created a situation now in which the cabinet minister can interfere at every single level, whether these bills go through a review or not.

There is no attempt here to balance anything, especially the environment and the economy. When is the government is going to admit that it is just using this bill to destroy the energy industry in western Canada?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite has it all wrong. We need good projects to go ahead, but in order to do that, we need a robust process that has the trust of Canadian people, and that is exactly what we did. The fact that the committee considered and approved amendments demonstrates a willingness that the previous government did not have. It was not willing to listen to people or find ways to make improvements that were recommended by indigenous peoples, industry, or environmentalists.

We are about finding solutions. We are about coming together, and of course we are about making sure that we get good legislation through, which is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend the minister for the excellent job she has done. She appeared before committee on Bill C-69 twice and then returned for the main estimates this past week. There has been unparalleled access to the minister as we have discussed this bill, and there have been many fantastic amendments put forward. The bill itself strongly addresses the many concerns that arose. The reason we lost trust in the environmental assessment process arose from the previous government's actions in meddling in CEAA 2012.

One of the areas the committee looked at, which the House will see with the changes coming forward at report stage, deals with timelines. I would ask the minister to speak to the significant improvements in timelines that will be dealt with through Bill C-69. Canadians and the House would benefit from those comments.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague. It is always a pleasure to appear before committee and talk about how we are advancing what we need to do, which is to figure out how we can make sure good projects go ahead. We know that we need to do that through very robust assessments.

However, in terms of what we have heard and what was reflected from a number of people, the focus is on how we ensure that good projects can go ahead with both regulatory certainty and clear timelines.

Our goal is one project, one review. We are streamlining the process and coordinating with the provinces and territories. We know this is very important in reducing red tape for companies and to avoid duplicating efforts, which we do not want to see.

We are making the process more predictable and timely. We are clarifying the process to engage stakeholders effectively and to identify potential issues with projects up front. These federal rules would actually increase regulatory certainty and clarity. I heard directly from CEOs and resource companies about the importance of having certainty of process. They also want to make sure that there is a process that is robust, and that is exactly what we are doing.

● (1925)

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an alternate reality being described by the environment minister about the process that got us to this point.

The Harper Conservatives gutted these environmental laws. Both Liberals and New Democrats promised to amend them. The NDP's promise was that we were going to do it on day one if we formed government. The environmental community had rewritten the laws already. They had given them to us so that whoever got to form government would be good to go.

However, the Liberal government dragged its feet for two and a half years and then presented an omnibus bill. When the bill came to the environment committee, some committee members quite reasonably asked, "Why not send this bill to all three committees, because it is three different pieces of legislation in one?" That was voted down by the Liberal majority. The witness list was truncated. Witness briefs came in after the deadline for committee members to submit recommendations. My colleague, the member for Edmonton Strathcona, proposed 100 amendments that all came from the environmental witnesses; not one of them was accepted.

In what world could the Liberals say that now they are going to shut down debate on this bill, since they have already shut it down in every way possible?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit confused, because the member opposite suggests that the NDP would have just brought in legislation without consulting, yet at the same time the NDP members are wondering why we did not listen to people. In fact, we actually did.

Let us consider this: we started with interim principles, which I and the Minister of Natural Resources introduced in January 2016. This was the first step in rebuilding trust and making sure we were making decisions based on science, knowledge, and evidence, taking into account the greenhouse gas emissions. We then had two expert committees, which were reporting to me and to the Minister of Natural Resources. There were two parliamentary committees that worked with the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. We continued to consult, and then we produced a discussion paper, which we consulted on again. I met directly with indigenous peoples, environmentalists, and industry many times.

We think we have a good outcome. We listened to folks and we were willing to take amendments, and we think we have an amazing bill.

Hon. Kevin Sorenson (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my New Democratic colleague said best when he said "Well, here we go again."

In the last election, the Liberals said that they would never move time allocation, that they would not move closure, that they would not shut down debate. However, this is the 40th time that they have done it.

The bill before us would have a massive effect on my constituency. I would say that from about 2000 to 2007, when I met with my rural municipalities, without exception the number one concern they had was the navigable waters act. They understood that if they were to replace a culvert or if they were to do any type of construction, they would have to call the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, or what they called the "fish cops". It meant massive red tape and it took forever to happen. This was their number one frustration.

To all those municipalities out there, the Navigable Waters Protection Act would be brought back under Bill C-69. There is not a rural municipality that will like it. Again, the Liberals are doing it, and they are shutting down debate. They are limiting us in being able to represent our constituents, and that is the shame.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned at committee yesterday, unsurprisingly the Conservatives are once again engaging in delay tactics by moving to delete every single clause of the act with not one substantive amendment. This has happened every step of the way, including at second reading. At committee, the opposition repeatedly refused additional meetings within the timeline established, and Conservative MPs delayed consideration of clause-by-clause.

Despite these actions, our government will ensure that we restore public trust, that we protect the environment, that we introduce modern safeguards, that we advance reconciliation with indigenous peoples and, of course, that we ensure that good projects go ahead and we get our resources to market. That is why we are taking appropriate steps to ensure that Bill C-69 moves forward.

● (1930)

Mr. Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, to follow up on the comments by my colleague from Alberta, with all due respect to the minister, does she believe that a municipal drain made by an excavator or a backhoe is either a navigable water or a fish habitat? I ask that with all due respect.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, we believe that when we make project decisions, we need to consider the impacts and make sure that good projects go ahead in a timely fashion with regulatory certainty.

Based on feedback that we heard from indigenous peoples, industry stakeholders, and the broader public during committee hearings, as well as from parliamentarians and the government, some 130 amendments were made. Amendments were a valuable part of the legislative process and the very reason the legislation was sent to committee for study. We listened to committee members. We listened to witnesses. We listened to other parliamentarians. Together, I am very proud that we helped to strengthen the bill.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. We are debating time allocation for 30 minutes. It is completely unfair that you are recognizing government members when they are supporting this. Members of the opposition have only 30 minutes to voice their concerns. Liberal members should not be getting a speaking spot during these 30 minutes.

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the hon. member for his intervention. This is the convention that we use. Other hon. members in the House, even if they may sit on the government side, have an opportunity too, as I indicated at the outset.

I will ask the clock to be stopped here momentarily.

The members of the opposition are certainly given priority in posing questions, but not to the exclusion of other or government members. That is the way we are going to conduct this 30-minute question period.

We will go now to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

Mr. Jonathan Wilkinson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, environmental assessment and how we actually look at these types of projects was a significant issue in the 2015 election campaign. Canadians said they had lost confidence in the processes because of the gutting of environmental assessment in 2012 under the Harper government. We said that we would restore public trust.

The critical issues that Canadians talked about were transparency and participation in these kinds of processes.

Could the minister talk a bit about what the bill does to restore confidence and transparency in how Canadians can understand how these processes are working?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my parliamentary secretary for all the hard work he has done in rebuilding public trust and restoring transparency.

The amendments and Bill C-69 would provide additional clarity and safeguards so that Canadians can have confidence in reviews of major projects. When we look at transparency, the bill requires assessment reports to incorporate a broader range of information, including a summary of comments received, recommendations on mitigation measures and follow-up, and the agency's rationale and conclusions. It requires that public comments provided during a project's reviews be made available online and that the information posted online be maintained so that it can be accessed over time. It is critically important that Canadians have an opportunity to provide input, that they have an opportunity to see what folks have said about environmental assessment, and that people understand how a decision was made.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, going along the lines of my friend from Huron—Bruce, we are talking about farmers. We have talked a lot about navigable waters and things like that. For years, I used to do round tables with farmers, and this was one of the biggest challenges they had. I spoke to the member for Edmonton Strathcona and asked what was discussed in committee regarding navigational waters. She said, "Absolutely zero".

I wonder if the environment minister could share the following with us, since nobody got to find out about it at committee and in the House. Could the member please advise us what the impact will be on farmers from the changes to the Navigable Waters Act?

● (1935)

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I was really pleased that the committee had time to do a thorough review of Bill C-69 and to make many thoughtful amendments. There were more than 80 witnesses and more than 100 submissions over a two-month review, and the quality of the amendments actually speaks to the rigour with which they were received. I am proud to say that our government supports the amendments.

We believe that this process is better for farmers. We believe the process is better for industry. We believe the process is better for indigenous peoples. We believe the process is better for folks who believe in science and making decisions based on evidence and facts. We believe, overall, that it will be a better process that will not only rebuild trust, but also ensure that good projects go ahead in a timely way.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for the minister's recollection, I want to read a summary from Bill C-262, an act to ensure that the laws of Canada are in harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Notice that it does not say anything about a preamble.

The minister previously mentioned that the Liberals accepted an amendment to the preamble, which, as every member in the House knows, is non-binding. I again ask the Minister of Environment, given that the Liberals rejected every single amendment by the member for Edmonton Strathcona at committee to make sure that Bill C-69 would be in harmony with UNDRIP, will she revisit her position and at least be consistent with her vote last week and accept the member for Edmonton Strathcona's amendments to Bill C-69? I am talking about the bill before us now. Will she be consistent? Will all of the Liberals be consistent with the way they voted last week?

The first nations of Canada are watching the government.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I hope they are watching. We are working very closely with them.

This legislation reflects the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. I would like to clarify that it does respond to feedback from indigenous peoples and organizations. The amendments clearly referenced the UN declaration in regard to the proposed impact assessment act, and the Canadian energy regulator act requires that the government, the minister, the agency, and federal authorities exercise their powers under the impact assessment act in a way that respects the government's commitments with respect to the rights of indigenous peoples.

It requires in the Canadian energy regulator's mandate that it exercise its powers and performance, duties, and functions in the same way. It clarifies that indigenous knowledge would be considered. This would not be limited to the traditional knowledge of indigenous people. This is very important to indigenous peoples. It requires transparency about how indigenous knowledge is used in impact assessments.

We think it clearly fits with our commitment to a renewed nation-to-nation relationship with indigenous peoples based on recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, partnership, rooted in the principles of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Mr. Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Energy Pipeline Association says that if Bill C-69 passes, no other major pipeline project will ever be built in Canada.

Now that we are the proud owners of a 65-year-old pipeline and that we would like to build another pipeline, how will the environment minister manage to get that built given this assessment?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused about the question. The projects that the member opposite is speaking about went through an environmental assessment. We built in additional consultations and reviewed the project in light of our climate plan and the 157 conditions for the project, and in light of our historic investments in oceans protection. We then approved the project.

When it comes to environmental assessments, we really believe that this process is good for industry, because it provides certainty that was not there before. It also provides a more timely process. That was really important. We heard from industry that they wanted to be sure about how things would be done and the timelines for the process. We worked very hard on that.

● (1940)

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for all her work in leading on the bill. It is long overdue that we modernize the environmental assessment process via the proposed impact assessment act and the other acts we are speaking to today in the House.

It is important to point out, and the minister has said this many times, that we in Canada today are supporting a lot of large-scale development projects, whether in mining or other natural resource sectors, hydro development, or pipelines, and we are going to continue to do that. We know that for these investments to work for Canadians, there has to be full consultation with them. There has to be full input from Canadians and there has to be input from indigenous people.

In modernizing these regulations, are we not really helping to build a stronger Canada with more input from all Canadians on how this is supposed to happen?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I know my hon. colleague cares very passionately about ensuring we do things the right way, which is through listening to Canadians, listening to indigenous peoples, listening to communities, and listening to industry.

That is exactly what we are doing now. We are ensuring that there are robust consultations and we are not limiting standing to a small group. If people have views or concerns about a project, they have the opportunity to have their views heard and concerns responded to.

This is really important, because Canadians said we needed to rebuild trust, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will return to the intervention by the member for Edmonton Griesbach. He asked how the government thought it could ever get another pipeline built under this new environmental assessment regime. The way it will that is through this bill. The minister is giving herself the power to completely ignore the new assessment process.

She talks about the Harper government having gutted the environmental review process. The gutting occurred because the decision-making procedure became totally political. It was being taken at the cabinet level, and politicians did not have any obligation to listen to scientists and heed the evidence.

The problem with this bill is that this prerogative is completely preserved. In fact, it is given only to the minister and not even to cabinet as a whole.

How can she stand in this place and say that she is approving the process when the government does not even need to apply the process to any projects, and it retains the right, initiated by the Harper government, to completely disregard the evidence and the science?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, we have made it clear that we need to make decisions on robust science, evidence, and facts. We have rebuilt trust by ensuring that this is key. Transparency will be there. When people see how decisions are made, they will see which evidence was used, which science was used, and which indigenous traditional knowledge was used. That is critically important. We know we have to make decisions based on science.

Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I represent many rural municipalities, and there is only one taxpayer's pocket that money comes out of. Municipal councils are very concerned and have expressed to me the high costs they are facing under the proposed legislation.

There is only one taxpayer and only one pocket money comes out of, and municipal councils are looking at this as being significant because they maintain roads, ditches, bridges, and culverts. This will be an onerous addition for local taxpayers.

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, as I said, we listened to everyone. We listened to rural municipalities, cities, indigenous peoples, and to industry. We come together to find a process that will work. It is really important that we have a robust assessment process and that we rebuild trust. That is the only way we can get good projects going ahead.

That was a real challenge under the previous government, which gutted the system. It did not have the trust of Canadians. Canadians told us we needed to do better, we needed to rebuilt trust, and we needed to consult with people. People living in rural communities should be consulted through environmental assessments. They should have the opportunity to make their concerns and views known, and they should be taken seriously.

At the end of the day, we need to make decisions based on science, evidence, and fact, and we need to do that in a transparent way. That is the only way to get good projects going ahead in the 21st century.

● (1945)

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when we were in government, working responsibly to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by regulation, protecting the environment at the same time as being conscious of protecting the economy, Environment Canada scientists and economists did cost-benefit evaluations of every piece of legislation. When we brought in legislation to reduce tailpipe emissions, which was very effective, the benefits were found to outweigh the costs, and we shared that information at committee. When we brought in legislation to phase out any new construction of coal-fired generating stations, we did a cost-benefit estimate and shared those dollar figures with the industry.

Why will the minister not share the cost-benefit studies that we know the department has done with regard to how much the carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family?

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased the member opposite cares so greatly about climate change. It is really unfortunate that the Conservative members of the environment committee voted to remove the consideration of the impact to our climate from Bill C-69. That might have been an oversight or a mistake. However, we know that unfortunately the Conservatives do not have a plan to tackle climate change. I do not know whether they all believe climate change is a problem or real. Nor do I think they understand the huge economic opportunity.

We understand that. We understand we need to be ensure we do right by our planet, that we tackle our emissions, but that we also have a plan to get our resources to market in a sustainable way. That is exactly what we are doing with Bill C-69. We certainly hope all parties will support it.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

STANDING ORDERS—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised earlier today by the member for Red Deer—Lacombe regarding the notice for time allocation given yesterday by the government House leader concerning Bill C-59, An Act respecting national security matters.

When raising the matter, the hon. member for Red Deer—Lacombe contended that nothing in the Standing Orders as written allowed a time allocation motion to cover both the report stage and third reading of a bill that had been sent to committee before second reading. To support his argument, the member referred specifically to Standing Order 78(3), which stipulates that a time allocation motion is allowed for both report stage and third reading only if the bill is sent to committee after second reading pursuant to Standing Order 76.1. Therefore, he asked the Speaker to rule the notice of time allocation motion out of order.

For guidance on this matter, I would refer members to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 673, which states:

> In the case of a bill referred to committee before second reading, the motion [for time allocation] can pertain to both the report stage and second reading stage as well as the third reading stage.

The member himself acknowledged that examples existed where precisely the same approach as was proposed in this time allocation motion was adopted by the House. I want to thank the hon. member for drawing the fact of these examples to my attention. Indeed, there have been at least four instances where this has occurred. I refer members to the precedents of May 6, 1996; another from November 22, 1996; one also from February 22, 2000; and, finally, one from May 28, 2015.

These precedents demonstrate that the House has seen fit to combine more than one stage in a single time allocation motion for bills that have been referred to committee prior to second reading. This forms a solid enough basis to indicate that this is now an acceptable practice with respect to time allocation motions. For this reason, I find that the government's time allocation motion is in order.

Nonetheless, I appreciate the hon. member's point. To avoid any further confusion, I would recommend that the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs review the matter, with a view to clarifying Standing Order 78(3)(a) vis-à-vis our accepted practices.

I thank the House for its attention on this matter.

* * *

IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACT

BILL C-69—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings at this time and put forthwith the question on the motion now before the House.

The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to House*]

The Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (2025)

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 736)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arseneault
Badawey
Baylis
Battle
Bossio
Breton
Caesar Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Chagger
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite Nation)
Lefebvre
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socurs)
Monsef
Murray
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Bagnell
Beech
Blair
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Dunoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville Marie Le Sud Ouest Île des
Morrissey
Nassif
Ng
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Rota
Rumy
Sahota
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 150

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Aubin
Beaulieu
Benzen
Bezan
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Caron
Clarke
Cooper
Diotte
Dubé
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Garrison
Gill
Gourde
Johns
Kelly
Kitchen
Laverdière
MacGregor
May (Saanich Gulf Islands)
Nantel
Pauzé
Reid
Shields
Sopuck
Stanton
Strahl
Vecchio
Webber
Wong
Zimmer 65
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Benson
Berthold
Blaikie
Boulerice
Cannings
Choquette
Clement
Davies
Donnelly
Duvall
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Hardcastle
Jolibois
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
Malcolmson
Moore
Paul-Hus
Quach
Richards
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Van Loan
Waugh
Weir
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Nil

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT, 2017

BILL C-59—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-59, An Act respecting national security matters, not more than five further hours shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and second reading stage and five hours shall be allotted to the consideration at third reading stage of the said Bill; and

that at the expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration at report stage and second reading stage and at expiry of the five hours provided for the consideration of the third reading stage of the said Bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the said stage of the Bill then under consideration shall b3 put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

● (2030)

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 67.1, there will now be a 30-minute question period. I invite hon. members who wish to ask questions to rise in their places so the Chair will have some idea of the number of members who wish to participate in the question period.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-59 is the government's answer to our Bill C-51 on national security, which we introduced in response to attacks that took place in Canada. The Liberal government said our bill was no good, so it introduced Bill C-59.

Recently, Abu Huzaifa al-Kanadi, who is known to have committed brutal crimes as an ISIS executioner, admitted to the CBC and the *New York Times* that he travelled for terrorist purposes. During a podcast interview, he proudly recounted what he did over there. It was from that podcast that CSIS and the RCMP learned what he did.

Can the minister tell us how Bill C-59 will improve situations like that now that these agencies have less power than before?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. gentleman's question, but I beg to differ with his interpretation. The fact is that the changes we are in the process of making with Bill C-59 would bring much greater clarity to the law. It would make the constitutional authorities much more clear and distinct so that our police and security agencies would have a much better sense of the scope and impact of their powers.

In consultations with those authorities, and I obviously had the opportunity to discuss these issues with them quite frequently, they said the one thing that bedevils their work is uncertainty, a lack of clarity, and doubt about what they have the authority to do and not do. In Bill C-59, clarification is brought to a great many matters with respect to CSIS and other agencies, which would make them more effective in conducting the important work they do to keep Canadians safe and to safeguard rights and freedoms.

● (2035)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Once again, I would ask hon. members to limit their interventions to one minute. That applies to the minister replying too.

[*English*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Beloeil—Chambly, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is the Liberal approach to Canadians' rights and freedoms in action. We saw the minister, the Prime Minister, and others on the front bench in the previous Parliament vote for the Conservatives' Bill C-51 and then say, "We don't like this bill. We're going to do better. We promise to do better. Just vote for us in the next election."

Here we are, at 8:35 on a Wednesday evening, debating in the House of Commons a time allocation motion, because the Liberals sent the bill to committee before second reading. They said that this part of the process would allow them to accept amendments that were outside the scope of the bill, and they were going to listen to them.

I had 120 amendments. Four were adopted after adopting Liberal wording. Of 25 Conservative amendments, zero were adopted. Of the half-dozen Green amendments, none were adopted.

Could the minister explain to me why time allocation is the way to approach what they claim is the biggest change to national security legislation in the last 30 years?

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and Security did very good work on this legislation. It heard from at least three dozen witnesses. It received some 95 briefs, and it amended the legislation no fewer than 40 times. The result of those 40 amendments was to take what the experts had previously referred to as a very good piece of legislation and strengthen it in a number of ways. I am very happy to accept those 40 amendments.

I also remind the House that this legislation is based upon the most extensive public consultation about national security ever in the history of Canada.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the member for Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, for his intervention and for his hard work on this file. I also want to say a proper thanks to the minister for bringing the bill forward, because it is time we updated our security arrangements with the different agencies. It is important that we bring about the ability to defend ourselves from cyber-attacks and enhance our cybersecurity so that we can go on the offensive, as well, to eliminate those threats. I think the minister would find, on the Conservative side, that we support that.

However, there were over 250 amendments brought forward at committee, and here again, we are having debate limited, and again we cannot raise the issues and concerns we have. We ask the government to kindly allow democracy to work and allow each and every one of us to raise the issues that are important on Bill C-59.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I read in the media the other day comments from that hon. member indicating words to the effect that by and large, Conservatives support this legislation. I appreciate his support for Bill C-59.

Again, I point out that this legislation is the product of extensive consultations. Fifty-nine thousand people responded online with respect to the proposals we have now before the House of Commons. Eighteen thousand submissions were received by email. Town hall meetings were held across the country in places like Halifax, Markham, Winnipeg, Vancouver, and Yellowknife. The standing committee held numerous meetings in preparation for the legislation. Social media was engaged, with Twitter and online conversations. There were 17 engagement meetings held by various members of Parliament across the country and 14 in-person sessions with experts from civil society.

All the results of that have been published so that all Canadians can see what everyone was saying to everyone about the content of this legislation.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, from the 41st Parliament, we have reams of quotes from Liberals regarding the use of time allocation by the then Conservative government. The quotes we have from the member for Winnipeg North would fill several pages.

What we have seen over the last couple of weeks is the government's use of time allocation and using the bare minimum, allocating five hours for debate on this legislation, on Bill C-69, which was done just before this, on Bill C-75, and on Bill C-76. The list goes on.

I have a simple question for the Minister of Public Safety. Given his party's record when it was the third party in the 41st Parliament, does he not feel the slightest bit of shame and contrition over the complete reversal of his position, now that he occupies that side of the House?

● (2040)

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, it is the function of Parliament and the committees of Parliament to deliberate, debate, discuss, take legislative proposals, seek amendments, and go through that valid exercise in democracy, but it is also the function of this place and the committees of this place to ultimately, having heard all the evidence and all the information, to take a decision and actually vote on the decisions that reflect the best interests of Canadians. That certainly is happening in spades with respect to Bill C-59.

There has been extensive consultation, the largest in Canadian history. There has been a fulsome process in Parliament, and now, as we come to the conclusion of the deliberation stage, we are getting closer to the point when it will be time to vote and take a decision.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, as I was unable to rise earlier tonight on time allocation on Bill C-69, I will say, parenthetically, that I find that time allocation even more offensive than this one, because we were time allocated in committee as well. I had clause-by-clause amendments on Bill C-69, and I had clause-by-clause amendments on Bill C-59. At least, to the credit of the Bill C-59 time management, we were allowed to debate all the amendments on Bill C-59, on public security, but we were stopped from debating two full bills' worth of amendments on omnibus Bill C-69.

Why is it required at this point, on a bill that has much that is good in it, to stop this place from being able to have a full debate? It is anti-democratic.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the hon. member's interventions and her comments with respect to Bill C-59.

There has been a huge amount of input already, including ample public consultation for a full year before we even introduced the legislation in the first place.

Now, at this stage of the legislation, there will be another five hours of discussion in the House, and following that, another five hours of discussion in the House, which should be ample time for all serious proposals and propositions and comments to come forward, based upon what has already been the most extensive—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for his responses so far. He elaborated on the comprehensiveness of the consultations, with about 70,000 inputs on this piece of legislation.

I am wondering if he could speak to the testimonials from key stakeholders and experts on this piece of legislation, because my constituents in Whitby would like to know what the experts say about Bill C-59.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, as with all complicated pieces of legislation, and as is the natural disposition of experts in whatever field, there are various opinions. However, some of the most prominent commentators from, for example, the University of Ottawa, Carleton University, and the University of Toronto, and former heads of various security agencies across the country, who usually, perhaps, are in the category of being critical of legislation of this type, have described this as the most significant overhaul of public safety and national security legislation in Canadian history, certainly since the CSIS Act was originally introduced in 1984. They described the changes we have made as progressive and aimed at a very important balance. Number one, keep Canadians—

● (2045)

The Deputy Speaker: We are moving on to the next question.

Questions, the hon. member for Calgary Shepard.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we heard before from a New Democratic member who pointed out, rightfully, that on a Wednesday evening, the government has now guillotined debate in the House for the second time on two important pieces of legislation. That is 41 times in this Parliament the Liberals have done so.

This bill was not a huge priority, as far as I know. It was reported back from committee on May 3, and it had one day of debate on May 28, so why the rush so suddenly now to force the House to consider the matter on an evening with five hours left and to then shut us down completely?

It is a brutal way of proceeding with the business of the House. Attempting to say that public consultation is a substitute for debate in the House is absolutely wrong.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, there was a huge opportunity on Monday afternoon to have four, five, or six hours of debate. The opposition members chose a different procedure to occupy the day in a different way and pre-empted their own debate with the tactics they used. They did it again this afternoon in the House of Commons. There could have been ample debate on many important topics in the House. Instead, they chose to fritter away the time that has been made available.

It is obvious that the opposition has no interest in serious, substantive debate. Members are overwhelmed with tricks and tactics that abuse the process, and the business of the country must go forward.

Ms. Cheryl Hardcastle (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister's depiction was rather disingenuous about what is happening here in the House today, and I take exception to it. The people in my riding of Windsor—Tecumseh followed the issue of Bill C-51 in earnest, and all of these comments and consultations the minister is bragging about now were actually presented to all of us in this place in earnest.

Those comments were meant to foster meaningful debate in the House. No one sent comments to the minister, and I guarantee that, thinking for one minute that it would mean that he was going to cut off debate in this place on a bill like Bill C-59. We have been following this issue for a long time. The minister tabled this last year, in the dying days of our spring session. We then heard nothing, and today he is going to pull the rug out and brag about consultations. It is very disingenuous.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, the opposition cannot have it both ways. On the one hand, members said we took far too long to discuss it with Canadians and present the legislation, which came in June of 2017, and then they said we were hurrying things too quickly and not allowing enough time for public discussion and debate. The reality is that we undertook to have the most extensive consultations in Canadian history. We did that throughout 2016.

We took all of that advice and information on board. We presented legislation in June 2017. We put it out in public for Canadians to examine, review, and weigh carefully, and then we brought the legislation before the House for debate. In the course of that debate, we put it to the committee before second reading so the committee could have maximum flexibility. The committee heard three dozen witnesses, received 95 briefs, and made 40 amendments. That seems to me to be the product of a democratic process that is working.

Mr. James Bezan: Mr. Speaker, the fog of hypocrisy is so thick that it is clouding the public safety minister's memory. He cannot even remember that when he was sitting in opposition for 10 years, including a stint as a member of the third party, he used the exact same democratic and parliamentary procedural argument used today, namely the opposition's role and responsibility to hold the government to account. He stood in this place and said that our government was wrongly stifling debate, and he is now being very hypocritical. He is essentially calling the pot black when he is the kettle.

I can tell you right now that this minister has way overstepped the correct parliamentary procedures that we follow in this place. To criticize the Conservatives, in my opinion, is contempt of this place.

The minister needs to apologize for that comment and understand that we have a responsibility as the official opposition to question every piece of legislation and motion the government brings before the House, including Bill C-59, which deserves to be debated in the full context in which it was supposed to be dealt with in this place.

● (2050)

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, this is from an hon. member who was quoted in the media a few days ago as saying that, by and large, he supports this legislation. I thank him very much for that support.

The fact of the matter is, the opposition has numerous opportunities for debate and discussion. If it chooses to use its time in a different way, that is its choice.

Ultimately, though, it is incumbent upon Parliament that, once a good, strong debate has taken place and there has been ample time for debate in the public arena, to take decisions. After several more hours of debate on this topic, which will run over the next several days, it will be time for members of Parliament to weigh all the issues, both pros and cons. If the opposition chooses to vote against the legislation, that is entirely its prerogative.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had an interaction on social media last week with one of my constituents who was very impatient about the fact that Bill C-51 was still in place. The constituent remarked, "You said you were going to change things. We elected you to change things. You have not changed things. Why are you not changing things?"

The public is very anxious to see this move forward, as the previous government was politicizing security.

Could the minister comment on how, once the bill is enacted, there would be a new open, and third party review of security matters, depoliticizing the process of security?

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, probably the single most important change we are implementing though Bill C-59 is to create a much stronger and more comprehensive review process. Instead of having individual review agencies that only have the authority to examine a single security or police agency, which is the case now, we are creating a new, comprehensive body called the national security and intelligence review agency. It would have authority across the entire government of Canada. The silos will be gone, and the review will be able to follow the case, the issue, and the evidence wherever it may be in any department or agency of the Government of Canada.

That will be complemented by the work of the new National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians. It will also be complemented by the work of the new intelligence commissioner, who will, for the first time ever, create actual oversight and not just review things after the fact.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Mr. Speaker, the minister said earlier that many experts, including former security advisers, were consulted. Richard Fadden, who everyone remembers, was the national security adviser. When he appeared before the committee, he said that Bill C-59 was beginning to rival the Income Tax Act for complexity. In his opinion, some subsections were incomprehensible and he hoped that the committee would help the government improve that situation.

Furthermore, Christian Leuprecht from Queen's University and the Royal Military College indicated that he respected the suggestion that CSIS should stick to its knitting. With regard to certain issues, he said that, yes, in the best of all worlds, we would want the RCMP to take care of some things, such disruption and whatnot. However, he also went on to say that the RCMP is struggling on so many fronts already that we need to figure out where the relative advantage of different organizations lies and allow them to quickly implement this.

Why is the government not listening to the former national security adviser, Mr. Fadden, who in my opinion knows what he is talking about? Why is the government not listening to Mr. Leuprecht?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the issue of complexity, unfortunately in this world issues related to public safety and national security are not simple. They are complex. They require expert work by our security and intelligence agencies and police forces. They also require expert work by the review agencies that examine the operations of the police and CSIS. We are improving the standards by creating the new national security and intelligence review agency. We are creating, for the first time ever, an opportunity for oversight before the fact rather than after the fact, complemented by the committee of parliamentarians.

● (2055)

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Mr. Speaker, I have just been checking the legislative record for Bill C-59. This bill was reported back to the House on May 3. When it came up for its first bit of debate at report stage on May 28, I think we had a couple of hours of debate. However, the only person who was able to engage in debate at report stage was the minister. The minister has been a member of this place for a long time. He knows that report stage is an important process wherein this House, as a collective body, gets to consider the work of the committee. I understand that the committee's work is very important and that the committee has gone through a long process. However, equally important is that this House consider the work of the committee at report stage. Therefore, I ask the hon. Minister of Public Safety this. How is it right to limit debate at this very important stage to five hours when he is the only person in this House who has spoken to this bill at this very important stage?

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, the first speaker at this stage of the debate was in fact the hon. gentleman's colleague, the NDP critic for this piece of legislation. Therefore, indeed, other people have participated in the debate, including the NDP.

The fact of the matter is there are five more hours of discussion. I would note with respect to the work at report stage that there were only three amendments proposed by the opposition in total, which would indicate a degree of satisfaction with the legislation. The opposition members had the perfect opportunity to propose an unlimited number of other amendments. They did not. They proposed three, and we're debating those three.

Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, having been on the public safety committee that travelled across Canada to hear from Canadians, as well as doing a study on the national security framework before we even got to Bill C-59, and then having heard from the witnesses the minister has spoken about, I wonder if he could speak to how the amendments reflect the testimony we heard, as well as how extensive those amendments were as a result of it coming directly to committee after first reading.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, the committee itself would be the better judge of how the actual amendments reflected the testimony it heard. Let me give one very significant example on the issue of intelligence activities conducted in other countries, not in Canada, that may involve the risk of torture or mistreatment in those other countries. It was very clear from the testimony before the committee, as well as the comments made by members of the committee, that they wanted to put into law very strong provisions to protect against any Canadian complicity in behaviour overseas that might involve mistreatment or torture. We have had that protection until now through the vehicle of ministerial directives. However, members of the committee wanted to make that tougher. They wanted to see those ministerial directives reflected in the law itself. Indeed, a whole new section was added that will ultimately be a standalone piece of legislation to ensure that there are very strong protections in Canadian law against any behaviour on the part of Canadians that would in any way be complicit in mistreatment or torture.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while this debate has been going on, I had an opportunity to look at some old *Hansards*. I found one from May 2013, when the hon. member was in opposition. He stated:

> obviously it is unfortunate when debate in the House is curtailed by the use of time allocation or closure. That impinges upon the democratic right of members of Parliament to adequately consider matters that are before the House.

He said that five years ago. How could the hon. member stand in the House for the last half hour completely unashamed by his own blatant hypocrisy?

● (2100)

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, the accuracy or not of a particular quote depends on the facts of the matter and the context in which the quotation is taken. Here, in the course of the last half-hour, I have laid out for people to judge how extensive the consultation was before the legislation was introduced.

Secondly, the fact is that we referred the legislation to committee before second reading to give the committee maximum flexibility to deal dealing with amendments. Then when the committee got to the work of clause-by-clause, after they had heard three dozen witnesses and received 95 briefs, they amended the legislation no less than 40 times. Now we are into the final stages in Parliament, which will include five more hours of debate, and then another five hours. That gives ample opportunity for the opposition to participate and make any worthwhile contribution they might care to make. If the last half-hour is any indication, I will not hold my breath.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government, for the second time today and the sixth time in a week has shut down debate, doing the bare minimum on major bills that Canadians have been waiting for years. Members have just voted on time allocation for Bill C-59.

This is a quote from the previous Parliament. I invite the minister to tell me who said this, and if it was a Liberal or a Conservative. It reads:

Canadians do not like it and they are waking up to the way the government is doing things. Who would have thought that Canadians would be familiar with procedures such as prorogation or time allocation during debates or the use of in camera in committees? Slowly but surely, Canadians are beginning to understand these procedures and beginning to question what the government meant when it promised, six and a half years ago, to be open, transparent and, most of all, accountable. I believe Canadians are beginning to feel that there is a contradiction between what has been promised and what is actually being done by the government.

I want to hear the minister's guess if it was a Conservative or a Liberal who said that, because it is hard for me to tell.

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that a judgment call needs to be made when dealing with legislation, in terms of assigning an appropriate amount of time for legislation to be considered thoughtfully and carefully. If the opposition chooses, rather than to engage in debate, to use parliamentary time for other purposes, then they are in fact forgoing their own opportunities.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: It is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith the question necessary to dispose of the motion now before the House.

The question is on the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

The Speaker: Call in the members.

● (2140)

[*English*]

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

The Speaker: Order. For anyone who thought the hon. member for Cape Breton—Canso could not count, apparently he can, but much too loudly.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 737)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Arseneault
Badawey
Baylis
Bittle
Bossio
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Comuzzi
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Finnigan
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hardie
Hébert
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Jones
Jowhari
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Morrissey
Nassif
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rudd
Rusnak
Saini
Sangha
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Alghabra
Amos
Arya
Bagnell
Beech
Blair
Bratina
Brison
Carr
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Etobicoke North)
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Joly
Jordan
Khalid
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lefebvre
Lockhart
Longfield
MacAulay (Cardigan)
Maloney
McDonald
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Murray
Ng
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Rota
Rumiy
Sahota
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Wilkinson
Wrzesnewskyj
Young—148

NAYS

Members

Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bezan
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boutin-Sweet
Caron
Clarke
Cooper
Dubé
Eglinski
Gallant
Aubin
Beaulieu
Berthold
Blaikie
Boudrias
Cannings
Choquette
Clement
Diotte
Duvall
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Garrison

Gerretsen	Gill	Waugh	Webber
Goodale	Gourde	Weir	Yurdiga
Hardcastle	Johns	Zimmer — 55	
Kelly	Kitchen		
Kmiec	Lake	**PAIRED**	
Lobb	MacGregor		
Malcolmson	May (Saanich—Gulf Islands)	Nil	
Moore	Nantel		
Paul-Hus	Pauzé		
Richards	Sopuck		
Sorenson	Stanton		
Ste-Marie	Strahl		
Van Loan	Vecchio		

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[For continuation of proceedings, see Part B]

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 6, 2018

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Climate Change
Ms. Pauzé 20371

Acadian Games
Mr. Finnigan 20371

Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry Service Award
Mr. Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry) 20371

Paralympic Sports
Mr. Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) 20371

Carmel Morvault
Mr. Caron 20372

Killick Coast Games
Mr. Whalen 20372

Taxation
Mrs. Wagantall 20372

Prime Minister's Awards
Ms. Ratansi 20372

Retirement Congratulations
Mr. McKay 20373

Relay for Life
Mr. Doherty 20373

Welland Rose Festival
Mr. Badawey 20373

Grandmothers Advocacy Network
Mrs. McCrimmon 20373

74th Anniversary of D-Day
Mr. Bezan 20373

Portuguese Heritage Month
Ms. Desrochers 20373

North Island—Powell River
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) 20374

D-Day
Mr. Paul-Hus 20374

74th Anniversary of D-Day
Mr. Spengemann 20374

ORAL QUESTIONS

International Trade
Mr. Scheer 20374
Mr. Trudeau 20375
Mr. Scheer 20375
Mr. Trudeau 20375
Mr. Scheer 20375
Mr. Trudeau 20375
Mr. Scheer 20375
Mr. Trudeau 20375

Natural Resources
Mr. Caron 20376
Mr. Trudeau 20376
Mr. Caron 20376
Mr. Trudeau 20376
Mr. Boulerice 20376
Mr. Trudeau 20376
Mr. Cullen 20376
Mr. Trudeau 20376

Agriculture and Agrifood
Mr. Berthold 20377
Mr. Trudeau 20377
Mrs. Block 20377
Mr. Trudeau 20377

Carbon Pricing
Mr. Poilievre 20377
Mr. Trudeau 20377
Mr. Poilievre 20377
Mr. Trudeau 20377
Mr. Poilievre 20377
Mr. Trudeau 20378
Mr. Poilievre 20378
Mr. Trudeau 20378

Indigenous Affairs
Ms. Jolibois 20378
Mr. Trudeau 20378
Ms. Boutin-Sweet 20378
Mr. Trudeau 20378

International Trade
Ms. Ratt 20378
Mr. Trudeau 20378
Ms. Ratt 20379
Mr. Trudeau 20379

Public Safety
Mr. Rayes 20379
Mr. Trudeau 20379
Mr. Rayes 20379
Mr. Trudeau 20379

Sports
Ms. Quach 20379
Mr. Trudeau 20379
Ms. Hardcastle 20379
Mr. Trudeau 20380

The Environment
Ms. Fry 20380
Mr. Trudeau 20380

Natural Resources
Ms. Harder 20380

Mr. Trudeau ... 20380
Mr. Jeneroux ... 20380
Mr. Trudeau ... 20380
Mr. Deltell ... 20380
Mr. Trudeau ... 20381
Mr. Brassard ... 20381
Mr. Trudeau ... 20381

Marijuana
Mr. Rankin ... 20381
Mr. Trudeau ... 20381
Mr. Dubé ... 20381
Mr. Trudeau ... 20381

National Defence
Mr. Bezan ... 20381
Mr. Trudeau ... 20381
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20382
Mr. Trudeau ... 20382

Ethics
Mr. Doherty ... 20382
Mr. Trudeau ... 20382

Transportation
Mr. Di Iorio ... 20382
Mr. Trudeau ... 20382

Indigenous Affairs
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) ... 20382
Mr. Trudeau ... 20383

Canadian Heritage
Mr. Nantel ... 20383
Mr. Trudeau ... 20383

Public Safety
Mr. Sikand ... 20383
Mr. Trudeau ... 20383

Official Languages
Mr. Clarke ... 20383
Mr. Trudeau ... 20383

Health
Mr. Tootoo ... 20383
Mr. Trudeau ... 20384

Points of Order
Standing Orders—Notice of Time Allocation
Mr. Calkins ... 20384
Ms. Chagger ... 20385
Decorum
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20385
Oral Questions
Mrs. Wagantall ... 20385

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Aboriginal Cultural Property Repatriation Act
Bill C-391. Second reading ... 20387
Motion agreed to ... 20388
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ... 20388

Opportunity for Workers with Disabilities Act
Bill C-395. Second reading ... 20388
Motion negatived ... 20389

Department of Industry Act
Bill C-396. Second reading ... 20389
Motion negatived ... 20390

Endangered Whales
Amendment ... 20390
Amendment agreed to ... 20391
Motion agreed to ... 20393

Supporting New Parents Act
Bill C-394. Second reading ... 20393
Motion negatived ... 20394

Child Health Protection Act
Bill S-228. Report stage ... 20394
Motion agreed to ... 20395

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 2018, No. 1
Bill C-74. Third reading ... 20395
Amendment to the amendment negatived ... 20396
Amendment negatived ... 20397
Motion agreed to ... 20399

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20399
Motion agreed to ... 20400

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Latin American Heritage Month Act
Bill S-218. Report stage ... 20400
Speaker's Ruling
The Speaker ... 20400
Motion in Amendment
Mr. Nantel ... 20400
Motion No. 1 ... 20400

Points of Order
Standing Orders
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20401

Latin American Heritage Month Act
Bill S-218. Report Stage ... 20402
Ms. Gladu ... 20402
Mr. Virani ... 20403
Mr. Kent ... 20404
Motion ... 20406
(Motion agreed to) ... 20406
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20406
Mrs. Kusie ... 20407

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Impact Assessment Act
Bill C-69—Time Allocation Motion
Ms. Chagger ... 20408

Motion 20408
Mr. Sopuck 20408
Ms. McKenna 20408
Mr. MacGregor 20409
Mr. Anderson 20409
Mr. Aldag 20409
Ms. Malcolmson 20410
Mr. Sorenson 20410
Mr. Lobb 20410
Mr. Wilkinson 20411
Mrs. Vecchio 20411
Mr. MacGregor 20411
Mr. Diotte 20412
Ms. Jones 20412
Mr. Blaikie 20412
Mr. Shields 20412
Mr. Kent 20413

Points of Order

Standing Orders—Notice of Time Allocation—Speaker's Ruling

The Speaker 20413

Impact Assessment Act

Bill C-69—Time Allocation Motion

Motion 20413
Motion agreed to 20414

National Security Act, 2017

Bill C-59—Time Allocation Motion

Ms. Chagger 20414
Motion 20414
Mr. Paul-Hus 20415
Mr. Goodale 20415
Mr. Dubé 20415
Mr. Bezan 20415
Mr. MacGregor 20416
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20416
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20416
Mr. Kmiec 20416
Ms. Hardcastle 20417
Mr. Longfield 20417
Ms. Damoff 20418
Mr. Lake 20418
Ms. Malcolmson 20418
Motion agreed to 20420

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca

HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 309 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 6, 2018
(Part B)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 6, 2018

[Continuation of proceedings from Part A]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

IMPACT ASSESSMENT ACT

The House resumed from June 5 consideration of Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, as reported (with amendments) from the committee, and of the motions in Group No. 1.

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight in support of Bill C-69. Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge that we are on the traditional territory of the Algonquin and Anishinaabe peoples.

This bill provides the framework for a modern assessment process that would protect the environment, attract investment, and ensure that good projects go ahead in a timely way to create new jobs and economic opportunities.

Today, I am going to focus specifically on how it supports our government's commitment to reconciliation and a renewed relationship with indigenous peoples. Meeting this commitment is challenging, but it is also necessary. I will discuss how Bill C-69 would advance reconciliation and partnership with indigenous peoples. I will also describe what the government has heard from indigenous peoples in recent months, and how their input has helped strengthen this bill.

From the very beginning, our government has been clear that no relationship is more important to Canada than its relationship with its indigenous peoples. We committed to a renewed relationship based on the recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership as the foundation for transformative change, and we have taken important steps to fulfill that commitment.

In 2016, Canada announced its full support of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples without qualification, with a commitment to its full and effective implementation. This February, the Prime Minister announced that we will work in partnership with indigenous peoples to develop a new recognition and implementation of rights framework to realign the relationship between the Government of Canada and indigenous peoples based on the UN declaration.

Development of the framework builds on steps we have already taken along this path. That includes launching a review of laws and policies to ensure that the crown is meeting its constitutional obligations with respect to aboriginal and treaty rights, guided by 10 principles rooted in section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, guided by the UN declaration, and informed by the report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action.

We have begun to make institutional changes to support the renewed relationship. In particular, we have announced the dissolution of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada and the creation of two new departments: Indigenous Services Canada and Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs. This will accelerate work already begun to renew the relationship with indigenous peoples and better enable them to build capacity that supports the implementation of their vision of self-determination.

We have announced our support for Bill C-262, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples act, as a strong first step in the process of implementation. More legislation will be needed in order to fully implement the declaration in Canada. Our government has also made historic investments in indigenous education, health, infrastructure, and communities, including to improve primary and secondary education on reserve, improve health facilities, build housing, and ensure access to clean and safe drinking water.

Finally, recognizing that indigenous peoples have long been stewards of the environment and have knowledge of the land that spans generations, we continue to work closely with them as we take action to protect and enhance Canada's environment and respond to the threat of climate change.

Meaningful participation of indigenous peoples informed the development of the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change, and our government is working in partnership with the Assembly of First Nations, Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, and the Métis National Council to implement it. Given the indigenous coastal communities' deep ties to Canada's oceans, we are partnering with them to implement our $1.5-billion oceans protection plan, for example in developing training programs to increase the participation of indigenous community members and women in marine safety jobs.

Finally, the bill before us today is built on a foundation of engagement with indigenous peoples, along with industry, stakeholders, and a broad range of Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

This bill is an important step, which would advance reconciliation and produce better project decisions by recognizing indigenous rights and working in partnership from the start. It would make it mandatory to consider indigenous knowledge alongside science and other evidence, including when the assessment is led by another jurisdiction.

Under the new impact assessment act, indigenous jurisdictions would also have more opportunities to exercise powers and duties, including taking the lead on impact assessments through substitution. Through measures such as the new early planning and engagement phase, the bill would ensure that indigenous peoples have opportunities to participate from the very beginning and throughout the assessment process.

● (2145)

Finally, it would place consideration of impacts on indigenous peoples and their rights at the centre of the decision-making process by including this as one of the key factors that must be taken into account when making a decision following an impact assessment.

Going forward, we are committed to working with indigenous peoples to define processes aimed at securing consent and collaborating with them as we develop regulations under this legislation.

Since the introduction of Bill C-69, our government has continued to engage with indigenous peoples at every opportunity. The Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development also heard testimony from a number of indigenous peoples and organizations during the study of the bill. In response to that testimony, the committee made several key amendments that enhanced the bill's potential to advance reconciliation and a renewed relationship.

Indigenous peoples have said that it is important that the bill fully reflect our government's commitment to implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Through amendments, the standing committee has ensured this commitment is at the forefront of the bill and will guide its implementation.

The bill now references the UN declaration in the preamble to both the impact assessment act and the Canadian energy regulator act. The purposes clause of the IAA now specifies that the government, the minister, the agency, and federal authorities will need to exercise their powers in a manner that respects the government's commitments with respect to the rights of indigenous peoples. Similarly, the mandate of the Canadian energy regulator would include exercising its powers in performing its duties and functions in the same way.

We have heard about the importance of taking a distinctions-based approach, one of the 10 key principles guiding our review of laws and policies. This is needed to ensure that the unique rights, interests, and circumstances of first nations, Metis, and Inuit peoples are acknowledged, affirmed, and implemented. In response to this feedback, the committee has amended the bill to ensure that membership of key committees under the legislation reflect a distinctions-based approach.

Indigenous peoples have told us that considering indigenous knowledge in impact assessments is critical. At the same time, they have called for better protection of this knowledge. The standing committee's amendments would strengthen both its use and protection of indigenous knowledge.

The bill would now require that assessment reports clearly show how indigenous knowledge has been taken into account. It also provides more safeguards across all acts to ensure appropriate protection for indigenous knowledge, while also recognizing that proponents may, at times, need to have access to it. Consultation would be required before indigenous knowledge could be disclosed, and ministers would then be able to place conditions on the disclosure of this information in light of those consultations.

In line with feedback from indigenous organizations, the committee has also clarified that indigenous knowledge would be considered, that this would not be limited to "traditional" knowledge of indigenous peoples.

Finally, throughout the bill, the committee has taken steps to further emphasize the commitment to meaningful participation in assessment processes for indigenous peoples as well as the public.

I am pleased to see that many of the amendments made by the standing committee directly respond to issues raised by indigenous peoples and will further ensure the bill can support reconciliation.

As I have described, our government is committed to advancing reconciliation and a renewed relationship in all of our actions, including this bill.

I want to recognize the contributions made to Bill C-69 by indigenous peoples and organizations across Canada. It is truly a privilege to work with indigenous peoples and to hear their perspectives and priorities. Our government looks forward to working collaboratively with indigenous peoples to implement the legislation.

I would once again like to recognize the committee for listening and responding to the testimony of indigenous peoples and organizations. This is a challenging process but, ultimately, a rewarding one as we work together to protect the environment, create economic opportunities, and advance reconciliation.

On a personal note, I would like to mention that I am a member of the environment and sustainable development committee. It was a great honour to be part of the considerations and the amendments on this legislation.

● (2150)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the government's answers to Questions Nos. 1671 to 1683.

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Cloverdale—Langley City, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

I like to remind the House every chance I get that Conservative Party members do not wake up every morning looking for ways to destroy the planet. On the contrary, we took very meaningful action when we were in power, and we are proud to work hard every day to make the environment a priority.

As I mentioned at the outset, I have the privilege of serving with my colleague on the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, and we have been under tremendous pressure from the government to fast-track the study of Bill C-69.

I must say that we have received a great deal of written evidence because we did not have time to hear from witnesses in committee. We even heard a presentation from a Quebec organization, and the representative told us she was the only person from her province who was able to testify. A number of Quebec organizations would have liked to take part in the debate. Their participation was important to us.

I would like to ask my colleague whether the Liberal government's process for Bill C-69 is adequate and whether we have done everything we possibly can to improve Bill C-69 so as to replace the 2012 legislation.

● (2155)

[*English*]

Mr. John Aldag: Mr. Speaker, I truly value the work my hon. colleague from across the way does on the environment committee.

On Bill C-69, I would like to go back. One of the issues that was the driver behind it was that Canadians had lost trust in the process. We heard that clearly during the 2015 election campaign. That was why it was part of our campaign platform. I am pleased with the changes that our government has made in Bill C-69 to the legislation that we saw prior to it.

To the member's question on process, this was a very robust consultation process that our government employed in coming up with the legislation. Consultations were held across the country, from province to territory, indigenous organizations to industry. It was a very robust set of consultations.

When it came to committee, we had opportunities to discuss it, to bring in witnesses. On many occasions, the opposition members did speak to the need to have more time to hear from witnesses. The public record will show, time after time, that our side said we would add days and hours, and that we would come in during constituency week. There was a very robust process at the committee stage, as we moved to report stage, looking at amendments and the testimony, and reflecting those changes in a very meaningful way in the legislation before us today.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt at all the commitment of my fellow British Columbian across the way to indigenous rights. I have spoken to him privately about this.

What I am worried about, though, is the commitment of his government. I acknowledge that the Liberals did vote in favour of Bill C-262 last week, and I commend them for doing that.

Now we have an opportunity before us to put that vote into action with Bill C-69. The member will know that the member for Edmonton Strathcona has several report stage amendments on the bill. I will specifically reference Motions Nos. 12 and 13, which would insert language into Bill C-69 to recognize indigenous rights, and make specific reference to the Constitution of Canada and to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Will the member be consistent with his vote last week and vote in support of these report stage amendments so we can make the bill come into compliance, as per the instructions of Bill C-262, that the laws of Canada be brought into harmony with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples? I would like to see the member's commitment, right here and now, to support these amendments.

Mr. John Aldag: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague his comments about Bill C-262 and how that will be reflected in Bill C-69.

As I stated in my comments today, we are dedicated to the idea of reconciliation, and not just the idea but actions of reconciliation. Through the amendments that were made, we have been able to reflect a commitment in the preamble to the legislation that the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is a key principle that needs to guide the legislation and how it is implemented.

Many pieces of the legislation deal with how indigenous knowledge will be used, how we will consult in a meaningful way with indigenous peoples. This really moves the principles and ideas of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples forward in a meaningful manner. I am quite happy that this is reflected here.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-69, an act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, introduced by the Liberal government.

As members no doubt know, this bill would create a new impact assessment agency of Canada to replace the Canadian Environmental Protection Agency. This agency will be responsible for all federal reviews of major projects and will have to collaborate with other agencies, like the new Canadian energy regulator, currently known as the National Energy Board, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, and offshore offices.

As a citizen and as member of Parliament for Lévis—Lotbinière, I have always taken an interest in protecting our waterways and keeping them safe. The prestigious St. Lawrence runs not too far from my home, and all of these issues are close to my heart. This is one of the reasons our Conservative government amended the Canadian Environmental Protection Act in 2012.

I obviously have many concerns about Bill C-69, in particular about the merits of these amendments and the Liberal government's flexible ethics. The government claims to be accountable and transparent. In reality, the Liberals keep showing that all they care about is helping Liberal cronies and promoting Liberal partisanship by filling their party's coffers, from coast to coast, under some guise or other.

On the surface, this bill has the noble goal of ensuring that all projects will be assessed on the basis of their impact on the environment and health, and on social issues. However, we may need to cry foul on the practices of these good old Liberals, masters of all that is crooked and scandalous. Take, for example, the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard and fishery allocations for a highly valued shellfish.

Where things go downhill with the Liberal government is that it puts forward these bills that give ministers more discretionary power, and then issues around the economy and so-called gender and indigenous rights take a back seat to the financial interests of the highest bidders and people with Liberal connections.

The government loves nothing more than a taxpayer-funded spending spree and thinks it can reinvent the wheel. This bill lays out its plan to spend up to $1 billion over five years on the new regime, on necessary changes, and, ostensibly, on increasing the participation of indigenous peoples and the general public.

Let me once again point out that these objectives look very similar to those of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, who we hope will soon be under investigation.

We all know that the former Conservative government knew how to make things better without raising Canadians' taxes. Canada's Conservatives understand how important certainty, predictability, and regulatory clarity are to ensuring the viability of major energy projects.

We know that these projects create tens of thousands of jobs and benefit communities across Canada, without any political favouritism. With the Conservatives, solid economic policies do not come at the expense of solid environmental policies, or vice versa.

Greater prosperity and better environmental performance always go hand in hand, but all the Liberal government sees are enticing opportunities to dole out goodies to friends and family members.

Bill C-69 will create two new regulatory burdens that, combined with the pointless federal carbon tax, will hurt Canada's global competitiveness even more without improving environmental protection in any way. This is scandalous.

These fresh repercussions are troubling, as are so many others we have suffered since this perpetually failing Liberal government took office.

The Liberals have a very long way to go before the next election if they want to start defending Canada's natural resource industry properly, instead of throwing up one roadblock after another.

Fortunately, in accordance with our values and commitments, we, Canada's Conservatives, will continue to oppose costly regulations that hurt jobs, economic growth, and global competitiveness.

Bill C-69 does not in any way meet the Conservative Party's objective of always striking a balance between protecting the environment and growing the economy.

● (2200)

When we look at what is happening with our neighbours, it is appalling to see that, while the American administration is relaxing regulations, lowering taxes, and encouraging energy production from natural gas or coal, Canada is regressing.

We cannot hamper our competitiveness by tightening regulations and creating uncertainty around the environmental assessment process. We need to stand up against and do away with any bill like this one that would harm Canada's economic competitiveness.

On this side of the House, we firmly believe that, in order to be effective, economic and environmental policies must not contradict each other, undermine each other, or cancel each other out. All the empirical evidence shows that prosperity brings with it a better environmental record. It is one thing for the Prime Minister to embarrass us and lose all credibility in our eyes and the eyes of the world, as he did on his trip to India, for example; it is quite another, however, for him to put Canada at a political disadvantage and jeopardize our position in the global economy. We will not allow him to do that.

We have repeatedly seen his picture in every situation and costume imaginable, but what we are interested in and concerned about on this side of the House is not Superman, it is Canada's image, its role, its prosperity, and the well-being of all Canadian families.

I am worried about how this bill will be used to determine whether a project should undergo an assessment by the agency or a panel. Beyond the process that has been set out, the answer is very easy and predictable. The assessment process will remain very political because it is the minister who will determine whether it is in the public interest for a project to be submitted to a panel instead of the agency's shorter impact assessment.

I am also concerned about why the government is saying that the bill will shorten the assessment process for resource projects. The government is misleading Canadians by saying that project assessments will be shorter. The planning phase adds 180 days to the process, even if the impact assessment is a bit shorter.

What is more, Bill C-69 provides for broad ministerial discretion to extend or suspend the process. In the *Consultation Paper on Information Requirements and Time Management Regulations*, a proposed impact assessment system, the Liberal government recognizes that in some cases, the proposed time limits in the legislation will not be met. In light of this discretionary power that will undoubtedly be abused, there is very little we can support in this legislative measure.

We support in principle the process providing for one assessment per project, as well as the commitment on the time limits proposed under the legislation. However, the bill puts up regulatory barriers and additional criteria that will invariably lengthen the assessment period.

We oppose Bill C-69 for many reasons, including the fact that it establishes a number of new criteria for impact assessment, in particular the impact that the project will have on Canada's climate change commitments. From now on we will have to consider the environmental impact upstream and downstream. The bill also substantially increases the number of people that could intervene in a review even if they do not have specific expertise. Finally, at the end of the planning phase and at the end of the impact assessment, the minister or the cabinet will make the final decision. The process remains political in nature, which creates ongoing uncertainty for investors.

There is nothing in today's announcement that would increase investor confidence or attract new investment to Canada's resource sector. We know that Canadian companies are already facing stiff competition even as the United States implements its plan to reduce regulations, cut taxes, and invest in coal-fired and natural-gas-fired electricity in order to cut energy costs.

Canadian businesses deserve a government that works with them, not against them. Canada's approach to fighting climate change must be realistic and strike the right balance between protecting the environment and growing the economy. The Conservatives support regulation, investment in clean technologies, and the mitigation of climate change if these initiatives produce concrete and measurable results for businesses and the environment.

● (2205)

We do not see any guarantees here.

[*English*]

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, during the last Parliament, the Conservative government gutted the environmental assessment process, removing protections of almost all of Canada's lakes and rivers. Bill C-69 does very little or nothing to reverse those changes.

Do the Conservatives still believe Canada's lakes and rivers should remain unprotected?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Yes, we have always fought for our lakes and rivers. Canada's bodies of water are extremely important.

We were the only government to invest in renewable energies. We invested in hydroelectricity and wind energy. We even asked the auto industry as a whole to work on decreasing fuel consumption, eventually reducing it from 10 litres to 5 litres per 100 kilometres in the long term.

Through our efforts, we managed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while also growing Canada's economy. That is our record.

● (2210)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Lévis—Lotbinière.

I am confused because my colleague is talking about a bill that does not exist. We are deliberating Bill C-69 today. It is a very weak bill that includes the same principles as under the Conservative government. It does not contain any measures that will actually strengthen the environmental assessment process or protect our bodies of water.

I am astonished to hear that he opposes this bill, because it contains the same principles as under the Conservative government.

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

In the bill before us, there is one major fundamental difference: it gives the Minister of Environment and Climate Change of the day the final say. This could prove to be extremely dangerous for the future of our country if we have a minister whose ideology privileges approaches that work against the Canadian economy. This bill could lead to serious problems in the future.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a piece of legislation that advances a number of issues in terms of protecting the environment, fish, and waterways, and it rebuilds public confidence and trust with respect to indigenous rights and so forth. It ultimately will strengthen the economy as we strive to achieve balance in advancing both the economy and the environment, all of which supports Canada's middle class.

I wonder why the Conservatives would not see the merit in advancing legislation of this nature, which will restore public confidence in the balancing of the environment and the economy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing in this bill to guarantee that indigenous communities will have their fair share in the future, especially judging by the actions of the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, who practically completely excluded indigenous communities from a tendering process.

This bill gives final say to the minister of the day, who could do exactly the same thing on a discretionary basis. We find that extremely troubling. That is one of the reasons why we will definitely not be supporting this bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I was on the fisheries committee and the environment committee, where we asked witness after witness if they could detail in quantitative ways how the legislation in 2012 affected the environment. Not a single witness could provide any proof that the changes we made in 2012 had any effect on the environment. As we say back home, the Liberal and NDP comments about our legislation are simply wind and rabbit tracks and nothing else.

I want to ask my colleague how our government improved the economic situation in Canada with our changes to environmental legislation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Gourde: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. He is absolutely right. We, on this side of the House, did our job when we were in government. We improved Canada's economic situation while reducing greenhouse gas emissions. As soon as we return to power, we will continue that work, which is being bungled at present.

[*English*]

Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in support of Bill C-69. As chair of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, I found it a privilege to be able to study this bill and report it back to the House with important amendments. These amendments were developed after listening to over 55 witnesses and receiving over 150 briefs from NGOs, indigenous peoples, unions, experts, and industry representatives. The amendments adopted were to bring more predictability, transparent decision-making, clarity on expectations, and timely reviews.

Our government is committed to regaining public trust in the review of projects and to getting Canada's resources to market. That is what this bill will do.

Since 2012, we have seen that weaker rules have hurt Canada's economy and our environment. Without public trust and support, projects cannot move forward and investment is put at risk. This bill would result in better rules to govern major project reviews, helping ensure that Canadians can benefit from over $500 billion in major resource projects planned over the next decade. It would provide predictable, timely project reviews to encourage investment. At the same time, it would ensure that our environment is protected and that we can meet our commitments to reduce carbon pollution and transition to a clean-growth economy.

Engagement with industry as well as with indigenous peoples, provinces and territories, stakeholders, and Canadians has been instrumental in the development of this bill. Over 14 months leading up to its introduction, the government heard from companies about what they need to keep good projects moving forward. Since then, the government has continued to stay engaged with companies, indigenous peoples, and stakeholders. Consistently, companies have told us that they need certainty about the process, about what is required and when, and about how decisions on project approvals are made. Bill C-69 would provide that certainty.

To begin with, one agency, the new impact assessment agency of Canada, would act as a federal lead for all major project reviews. This will result in reviews that are more consistent and more predictable. We have consulted with Canadians on the criteria that will form the basis for a revised project list, which will provide clarity on how our new rules will apply.

Through a new early planning and engagement phase, companies would be able to identify and address issues early on, before an impact assessment begins. The bill provides clarity on the scope and outputs of this new phase. It would result in tailored impact statement guidelines that reflect factors and requirements relevant to the project, as well as a co-operation plan, an indigenous engagement and partnership plan, a public participation plan, and, if required, a permitting plan.

Details on these products will be set out in regulations, which the government is consulting on now, and which would come into force at the same time as the impact assessment act. The early planning stage would define requirements and clarify expectations so that companies would know what was expected of them, and when. It would help them design and plan their projects and more effectively engage indigenous peoples, stakeholders, and local communities.

The minister would also be able to inform companies early on if a project is likely to have negative impacts, without stopping the process. This would give companies an earlier opportunity to decide whether to continue with an impact assessment.

Bill C-69 would ensure that companies know in advance what would be considered in a project review and in decision-making. Reviews would take into account not just environmental impacts, but also social, economic, and health effects, as well as impacts on indigenous peoples and their rights.

This bill would also provide strong transparency measures so that proponents are informed about key decisions, as well as the reasons behind them. That includes, for example, decisions to extend the timeline for a review or to refer a final decision on a project to cabinet.

When final decisions are made on whether a project will go ahead, the proponent would be informed of the reasons for the decision and would be assured that all key factors were appropriately considered.

Bill C-69 would also respond to what we have heard from industry by providing more timely assessments. Our better rules would include stricter timeline management, with shorter timelines for assessments. Specifically, timelines for agency-led reviews would be reduced from 365 to 300 days; panel reviews would be shortened from 720 days to a maximum of 600 days; and, in addition, panel reviews for designated projects reviewed in collaboration with a federal life-cycle regulator would be shortened to 300 days, with the option to allow the minister to set the timeline up to a maximum of 600 days if warranted, based on the project's complexity. As well, timelines for non-designated projects reviewed by life-cycle regulators would be shortened from 450 to 300 days.

● (2215)

Regulations would require clear rules around when timelines could be paused. When there is a decision to extend a timeline, the proponent would need to be informed about the reasons why.

I would like to briefly mention how Bill C-69 would support one project, one review, and how this would contribute to our goal of getting our resources to market. The bill would provide for joint reviews and substitution, in which a review process led by another jurisdiction would fulfill the requirement for a federal review. Those provisions would help promote cooperation with provinces and territories, reduce red tape, and prevent duplication. We are also increasing opportunities for partnership with indigenous peoples and for indigenous governing bodies to take on key responsibilities. That could include taking the lead on assessments through the bill's substitution provisions.

Our government has heard from industry how important it is for Bill C-69 to provide a smooth transition between the current assessment regime and the new regime. Transition provisions must be clear and predictable to encourage investment and keep good projects moving forward. Bill C-69 would provide that clarity by setting out objective criteria to identify projects that would continue to be reviewed under CEAA 2012, giving companies the option to opt into the new process, and confirming that no one would go back to the starting line.

I would just like to emphasize that as a result of the committee's work, Bill C-69 now includes stronger transparency provisions that would benefit proponents and provide more certainty and consistency across the legislation. For example, assessment reports would be required to incorporate a broader range of information, including a summary of comments received, recommendations on mitigation measures and follow-up, and the agency's rationale and conclusions. Public comments would have to be made available on the Internet, and information posted online would need to be maintained so that it could be accessed over time.

The standing committee also addressed feedback from industry that some smaller projects with federal life-cycle regulators, such as offshore renewable energy projects, could face longer reviews than they do now. The amendments address this by establishing a new timeline of 300 days for reviews of projects with a life-cycle regulator, with the possibility of setting the timeline to a maximum of 600 days, if warranted.

Complementing the existing provisions to support timeliness, the amended bill would set a clear 45-day timeline for establishing a review panel. The committee's amendments would clarify that public comments must be provided during a time period specified by the agency, so that meaningful participation would be ensured and balanced with the need for timely assessments.

The standing committee further advanced the objective of one project, one review. As a result of the committee's amendments, integrated review panels involving federal regulators would also be able to include other jurisdictions, making it possible to have just one assessment that meets all of the requirements. Finally, the standing committee responded to feedback from companies by making the bill's transitional provisions even clearer.

To conclude, the bill responds to what we have heard from companies, providing clarity on expectations and requirements, predictable timely reviews, and transparent decision-making. By rebuilding public trust, it would encourage investment and help create new jobs and opportunities for Canadians.

● (2220)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank my colleague from King—Vaughan, who is a very generous and extraordinary individual. She does excellent work as the chair of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. I wanted to acknowledge that and thank her for it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Joël Godin: Members are right to applaud, Mr. Speaker. She does great work, but as I mentioned earlier, the process was expedited. I am not entirely convinced that, as parliamentarians, we did an excellent job, that our work was thorough and effective, and that it will really remedy the problems with the bill from 2012. I must say that I heard an expert in committee, a professor from Dalhousie University, suggest that we scrap this bill and start from scratch. I am not sure we were effective enough.

Could my colleague answer this question. Could we have been more effective and taken the time needed to, once again, really make the environment a priority?

● (2225)

[*English*]

Mrs. Deborah Schulte: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for being so generous with his comments. I too really appreciate the work he does at committee. Generally, we have a very co-operative and collaborative approach. Lately, it has been a little rockier, but, overall, some amazing work has been done at committee and I appreciate his work greatly.

When it comes to the process, I know that my colleague will acknowledge that there was a lot of interest in this bill and that as a result, we invited a tremendous number of people from across the country. Indigenous groups, industry groups, union groups, specialists, and NGOs were very interested in speaking to us. We set a criterion for how to assess which groups would come. We chose those that speak for the country and then asked everyone else identified by the committee, more than 150 witnesses, to provide briefs. We went through those individually and brought forward over 400 amendments, which we discussed and voted on.

I specifically asked the committee many times to provide more time by extending the hours and days of consideration, and that was refused, so I think we did a pretty thorough job.

Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the realities in my riding of North Island—Powell River is just how much people care about the environment. We live in an amazing and beautiful area and need to know that the environment will be protected, because it means jobs and the well-being of indigenous communities, families, and people in the community.

One of the concerns I heard again and again, and continue to hear, is that there is a lack of trust and faith in the process. During the election campaign, the Liberal platform stated, "We will end the practice of having federal Ministers interfere in the environmental assessment process." However, we know that in clause 17 of Bill C-69, we see the very opposite.

I would like the member to explain to me why the environment minister will still have a lot of power to make decisions. If we looking at a process that is going to meet the scientific evidence, and that is how decisions are going to be made, why is it that the minister will still have this incredible power and how will that allow communities to trust the process? When I talk to people in my riding, this just raises the concern again.

Mrs. Deborah Schulte: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question.

As we have already heard from some members today, the bill will strengthen some fundamentals. The amendments sought to provide certainty, respect for indigenous rights, clarity, and to restore trust.

The other issue I want to touch on is science. We wanted to make sure that there was a clear commitment to science. Science will inform the work that is being done. At the end of the process, we need to be accountable as members and accountable to the people of Canada. We have heard many times that science is important and has to be the basis of decisions, and if the minister is going to intervene, she will have to explain why she does what she does. That was not done before. We have put measures in the bill to make sure that if the minister and cabinet make a decision, they will have to justify why they made it. This strengthens and improves what we have today, for sure.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the member of Parliament for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, I am pleased to be given this opportunity, on the eve of the Ontario provincial election, to deliver a warning to voters about Bill C-69 about why they need to elect a majority Doug Ford Conservative government.

While there are many aspects of this government legislation that I find objectionable, the greatest cause for concern is the politicization of the Canadian energy board. The decision to move from a fact-based, scientific decision-making process to one based on greed is a regressive move that Ontario electricity ratepayers are all too familiar with.

Whereas under the previous Conservative government Canadians had an environmental and regulatory system that commanded the confidence of all Canadians, the Liberal strategy to invoke a culture war to deflect from the true fallacy of what is being proposed can only end badly for all Canadians.

Under the Conservatives, the National Energy Board was an arm's-length regulatory agency in the way the Ontario Energy Board used to be. The decision by the Toronto Liberal Party to stack the Ontario Energy Board with political appointees, which is similar to what is being proposed federally in Bill C-69, has resulted in the highest electricity prices in North America. Energy poverty in this province has become the new normal, particularly among seniors, anyone on a fixed income, and the working poor.

What is so very unfortunate is the support given by the NDP for these same failed energy policies, failed policies that are being repeated at the federal level in misguided legislation like Bill C-69, which we are discussing today.

Let me be clear: There is a direct link between the failed policies of Kathleen Wynne and the NDP, which supports those same policies. The direct link is Gerald Butts, the Prime Minister's principal assistant. He is the most powerful unelected, unaccountable, technocrat in Ottawa today. He is in the same position he held in Toronto when he set up the greedy policies that have resulted in Ontario being the most indebted subnational government in the world today.

As for the green hustle, anytime anyone questioned the "Greed" Energy Act, the environment was used as an excuse, with zero facts to back up the claim.

For the benefit of all Canadians watching this debate, I encourage voters in Ontario to go to the Global News website for stories from June 1, and watch its investigative story exposing the corruption that has reduced Ontario to a have-not province.

Global News obtained 4,000 pages of internal emails and documents from the now-defunct Ontario Power Authority showing billions of dollars in unnecessary spending that could have been avoided had the government followed the early advice of the Ontario Power Authority, which was tasked with designing many of Ontario's energy policies. In fact, according to Global News, when it comes to the FIT and microFIT programs, which are a key component of the province's greed energy act, documents show that decisions made by the Liberal government in 2009 and 2010, when Liberal Party insider Gerald Butts was in Toronto, as well as design flaws in the programs themselves, put Ontario on a collision course with rising electricity costs.

Brady Yauch, an economist and executive director at the Consumer Policy Institute, independently reviewed all 4,000 pages of documents and shared his views with Global News. According to the director of the Consumer Policy Institute, "The province hijacked the [FIT and Micro-FIT] programs from the very expert agencies it established to handle these types of technical, complicated energy policies. Worse still, [the Liberal Party ignored]...concerns of those experts [about] overpaying [electricity] generators." Mr. Yauch observed, "That's very concerning, because now you have a political electricity system, as opposed to one that's based on economics or cost-effectiveness."

This is what Bill C-69, the federal legislation we have before us now, will do at the federal level.

● (2230)

Further quoting Global News, the man responsible for designing the FIT and microFIT programs, Jim MacDougall, also said that the government "ignored" expert advice that could have saved Ontarians billions of dollars in greed energy spending. So much for fact-based, scientific decision-making. The Liberal Party refused to answer specific questions about the FIT and microFIT programs in relation to the Global story.

As Global News reported, "Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO), which merged with the Ontario Power Authority in 2015, also refused to answer specific questions about design and implementation of" the failed programs. "Instead, it provided a written statement to [Global News] saying the OPA 'worked closely'" with its political masters "to make sure that the programs met the government's 'broader economic and environmental policy objectives.'"

On October 1, 2009, the OPA started receiving applications through the renewable energy programs it was directed to create. Unlike the main program, designed for large-scale commercial projects, such as big solar farms, industrial wind turbine installations, and hydroelectric dams, the microFIT program was supposedly "created so homeowners could put a solar panel on their roofs to 'offset' electricity use and lower hydro bills."

The Global News report continues:

> What ended up happening, however, is the [Ontario Power Authority] was quickly overwhelmed by the number of Micro-FIT applications it received.
>
> Electricity bills started to skyrocket.
>
> By mid-November, about six weeks after the program was launched, emails show the [Ontario Power Authority] was worried some applicants were "gaming" the system—meaning that people were submitting multiple applications for small solar projects on the same property, which, though technically not against the rules, violated the "spirit" of the program.
>
> "Aggregators", as they became known, submitted hundreds of Micro-FIT applications with plans to set up solar panels on "vacant lots" or on farmers' fields. This was a problem, because Micro-FIT contracts were to pay nearly double what large solar projects received.
>
> And because the cost of building larger projects was significantly lower than what a homeowner might pay to put a solar panel on a roof, aggregators received higher government payouts than the...OPA initially intended.

One of the worst abusers of the greed energy program was the Ontario president of the Liberal Party of Canada, Mike Crawley. His company received a contract that guaranteed $66,000 a day for 20 years, or $475 million over the life of the contract. During the bidding process, he even had the nerve to send out an email encouraging various other parties to attend an infamous pay-to-play soirée, at $5,000 a pop. Liberal Party—

● (2235)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. I know the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke is very entertaining, and I hate to interrupt the flow of the narrative, but it has nothing to do with Bill C-69.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to thank the hon. member for her point of order, but normally what happens is I leave it to the individual members to come to it. I am sure the hon. member will bring it around to tie into what we are talking about.

The hon. member.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, the $475 million payout for the solar panel company he was with was even more astounding when we consider the fact that most of the power electricity consumers are forced to pay for from that contract is sold at a loss to American border states.

People gaming the system could have been avoided. However, this is what happens when a regulatory body is stacked with partisan political appointees, which is what Bill C-69 would do.

Consumer watchdog Brady Yauch said this was a big mistake and that the OPA was ignoring the issue of aggregators. How many billions of dollars the greed energy policy actually ends up costing us remains to be seen.

The email said:

> It's one thing to keep...government in the loop with changes and issues. But it's another thing to take direction from government—especially on very detailed programs.
>
> These are technical issues that the government does not fully understand

Mr. MacDougall said,

> Like I said, I no longer know where the lines are between [the Ontario Power Authority] and government.
>
> I think the government didn't trust the OPA to launch and roll out this program as aggressively as they wanted us to.
>
> When we would give advice they would consider it, but they would make their own decisions and largely ignore some of the key policy recommendations that we were trying to put into place

The Global News article continued, "The government refused to answer specific questions about whether the policy advice was being ignored."

If government members want to understand why Kathleen Wynne conceded the election to Doug Ford last weekend, they should heed the Global News story I have been quoting from. The parallel is the pipeline debacle that is unfolding as I speak. There is real anger in Ontario over the mismanagement of Ontario—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that the previous Harper government never made any political appointments, nor tried to tell institutions like the Supreme Court what to do.

The bill talks about streamlining the process, creating a one-project, one-review model, allowing for equivalency with provinces to eliminate duplication. It would allow companies greater certainty and would permit companies to save money by being able to plan better, because they would know what was expected of them. I wonder if the hon. member does not think those are good things, from a business point of view.

Second, we know that the northern gateway pipeline failed in the court because the process did not properly consult indigenous peoples. This bill would allow for greater consultation. Would that not make those projects more court-proof?

● (2240)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, we are not seeing any certainty, and certainly the Kinder Morgan people did not when they just left and made us pay for an old pipeline. We still have to pay out billions of dollars to get one going.

The Liberal Party thought everyone would see solar panels and industrial wind turbines and think that Ontario made the right decision. Instead, every time electricity ratepayers in this province see an industrial wind turbine or a solar panel, it reminds them how badly they are being fleeced on their electricity bills.

The same thing will happen at the gas pumps. Consumers will be reminded every time they fill up at the pump of the government's carbon taxes. On behalf of all Canadians, keep politics out of the National Energy Board.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I do not think the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke is interested in the bill we have before us, Bill C-69. Bill C-69 does not include anything about carbon taxes. The bill actually does not apply in any way to the issues she has raised about Ontario's policies for energy.

Personally, I cannot vote for Bill C-69, because it is so terribly weak and fatally flawed because of the persistence of the philosophy that is now embedded in the Government of Canada, left behind by the previous Harper government. Therefore, while I suppose I share the way I will vote with her, I cannot share anything else.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, I was talking specifically to Ontario voters, but I am hoping that voters from across Canada will learn from our experience. That is the lesson we learned when we thought everything was supposed to be renewable and good for the environment, but we opened up our hydro bills, and they were ten times the amount they had been a few months before. That was a price shock. Once burned, twice shy. When they go to the pumps, and they are burned at the pumps, they will have that same anger for the federal Liberals they are currently feeling provincially.

Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am really excited when I hear the Liberals talk about past governments. If we want to talk about Liberal DNA, it is just entangled in corruption. That is exactly what we have heard about tonight.

Earlier the minister said we need to have trust, but when we look at the bill and what has happened around it, we see that there is absolutely no interest in science. It is going to create a massive bureaucracy. The Liberals have lost hundreds of billions of dollars of investment in the country already, based on their approach to the environment and energy assessment.

We have the same people doing the same initiatives that were done in Toronto. Does the member expect that they will have the same results and the same disaster replicated across Canada?

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I am trying to say. They drained the treasury in Ontario. Now they have come to the federal government and are working on draining it here. There are billions of dollars for a pipeline someone else was willing to build. They put in this legislation for redundancy and study after study when they had already been done. All these are roadblocks and a kill switch for any pipeline ever to be built as long as the Liberals are in power, or the NDP.

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not sure if this is an appropriate time to do so, but I would like to correct something I said that was erroneous. I believe I said that the Supreme Court overturned the approval of the northern gateway pipeline project, but it was in fact the Federal Court of Appeal. I apologize. I attribute this to the late hour of the debate.

● (2245)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): We have a correction. I thank the hon. member.

Mr. Churence Rogers (Bonavista—Burin—Trinity, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today's debate on Bill C-69. The proposed changes are important, because they build on and strengthen the legislation that has been described as historic, groundbreaking, and a major turning point for resource development in Canada.

There is a good reason for all these superlatives, because Bill C-69, even more so now that it has been amended, is a potential game changer in the way Canada reviews new major resource projects by creating greater investment certainty; restoring public confidence; advancing indigenous reconciliation; strengthening protections for our environment, fish, and waterways; and establishing better rules for co-operation among the various levels of government and federal regulatory agencies.

For example, there is a proposed early engagement and planning phase that would bring the proponents of new projects together with local communities and indigenous peoples to identify priorities and concerns. This would have two immediate benefits. First, project proponents and their investors would get a clearer lay of the land before they spent a lot of money advancing their proposals. Second, by identifying the key issues early, the project reviews would be shorter and more focused.

These kinds of results would be transformational for Canada's resource industries. They would enhance our competitiveness at the same time that we are ensuring sustainability, demonstrating yet again that economic prosperity and environmental protection are not competing interests but equal components in a single engine that will drive clean growth.

Bill C-69 features many other innovative measures that are equally significant. I am pleased to see that the amendments proposed at committee are consistent with the spirit and intent of the legislation. They include amendments that would further advance the recognition of indigenous rights, amendments that would enhance public participation and transparency, amendments to improve timelines and predictability, and amendments to clarify both ministerial discretion and the factors to be considered during impact assessments and regulatory reviews.

Many of these amendments extend across all acts within the bill, but I would like to focus my time on how the proposed changes would reinforce the goals of the Canadian energy regulator act.

For those who may be watching at home and are new to Bill C-69, the proposed new Canadian energy regulator would replace the National Energy Board. Our aim is to create a more modern federal regulator, with the required independence and the proper accountability to oversee a strong, safe, and sustainable Canadian energy sector in this clean-growth century.

The Canadian energy regulator act proposes to do this in these five key areas: more modern and effective governance; greater certainty and timelier decisions for project proponents; better public consultations; greater indigenous participation; and stronger safety and environmental protections. The amendments before us would move the yardsticks in each of these areas.

For example, we have a proposal from committee to clarify the factors to be considered by the Canadian energy regulator to ensure that climate change is considered when the regulator is making decisions about non-designated projects, such as pipelines, powerlines, and offshore projects.

I am disappointed in the opposition for how it has treated this historic piece of legislation. During the committee review, opposition members attempted to completely remove the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board from the review panel process. This was quite shocking, as it was proposed despite massive objections from Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, as well as the experts.

In fact, the biggest single criticism of the 2012 changes by the previous government in Newfoundland and Labrador was that it left the CNLOPB out of the entire process. It is clear that the opinion of the Conservatives has not changed. I am proud that Bill C-69 incorporates the critical role of the CNLOPB.

In its appearance before the environment committee, the CNLOPB said that Bill C-69 would provide for improvements over the current process and would allow it to work more closely and more collaboratively with federal agencies and regulators. It also said that regional assessments allowed for in Bill C-69 would strengthen the process.

● (2250)

Other amendments propose ways to enhance the new energy regulator's transparency and to provide for more meaningful opportunities for Canadians to participate in the regulatory process. This includes a requirement for processes and funding to support indigenous and public engagement. Further, there is an important amendment stipulating that whenever a project proponent issues a notice, which means that it has submitted information to the Canadian energy regulator, that the regulator would be required to put that notice on its website. This is an important step to inform the public about projects.

As for discretionary powers, the only exemption orders that would now be allowed under the Canadian energy regulator act would be to ensure safety and security or for the protection of property or the environment.

Other proposed changes build on the principle of one project, one review. For example, we see an amendment proposing that integrated review panels be allowed to include other jurisdictions, thereby ensuring a single impact assessment that still meets all requirements.

Also, other amendments that would provide greater certainty about the transition to a new review process. This includes adding objective criteria to determine which projects would continue to be reviewed under CEAA 2012, as well as a provision to encourage proponents to opt in to Bill C-69's new process. Of course, there are further clarifications that no project proponent will be asked to return to the starting line.

These are all good amendments that our government welcomes.

These changes will help to create an even better Canadian energy regulator. They will ensure good energy projects go ahead with timely and transparent decisions reflecting common values and shared benefits. They would lead to smarter resources, more effective reviews, and better results.

Taken together, Bill C-69 and its amendments are appropriately ambitious and historic. They reflect the adage that one has to swing for the fences if one wants to hit a home run. Bill C-69, as amended, does that.

I hope all members will support Bill C-69 and its changes so we can get on with the business of building an even better Canada, one where the way we manage and develop our natural resources truly reflects who we are as Canadians and the values we cherish most.

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, earlier today I had the opportunity to ask the Minister of Environment a question, specifically looking at the Navigable Waters Act. Unfortunately, I was not able to get any information. I also indicated that I had spoken to the member for Edmonton Strathcona regarding the Navigable Waters Act. It was not discussed nor were those amendments discussed in committee.

I am from a rural community. One of the important factors is about farmers being able to get onto their fields to do the work that needs to be done. We can we look at municipal sewers as well as different systems.

Could the member share with us the impact the bill would have on farmers? From everything I am hearing, it is going to be negative. I am very concerned that all of this is going pull back on the abilities that had transpired for our farmers in the last six years.

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, during my tenure on the environment committee as the member of Parliament for Bonavista—Burin—Trinity and working with other members of Parliament, I found it to be a great exercise.

As other hon. members have said, the committee worked extremely hard on the legislation. We accepted many briefs, and a lot of witnesses presented to our committee. During that entire process, we listened to experts, people from the environmental community, people from indigenous communities, industry, and Canadians from across the country on this issue. Based on the presentations and the information we heard from them, we brought forward a bill with these amendments, which we believe will marry the economy and the environment.

● (2255)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I hope the member for Bonavista—Burin—Trinity will forgive me for correcting some of what he may believe actually happened but is revisionist history.

In 2012, it was the previous Conservative government that, for the first time ever, proposed that the offshore boards, the NEB, and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission should oversee environmental assessments. The Conservatives did not get around to the regulatory changes to put the offshore boards in that position.

I never thought I would see the day that the Liberals, who had railed against those changes in opposition and voted against them, would come into power and then proceed to make the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board and the Canada-Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board responsible authorities under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.

My friend will know I disagree with this step. It is not with disrespect for the Newfoundland agency. It is because, by law, that regulator has a responsibility and a mandate to expand offshore oil and gas. It has a statutory conflict of interest, and it is probably the most objectionable part of an objectionable act that the regulator is playing a role in environmental assessment.

Mr. Churence Rogers: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is well aware, I totally disagree with her perspective on that issue. These organizations, the CNLOPB and the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board, bring to this process of future development a lot of experience, expertise, and knowledge.

For all the years of work that have gone on in Newfoundland and Labrador, the CNLOPB has made a tremendous contribution to the offshore oil and gas industry. We all want to protect our environment, but that experience cannot just be tossed aside. We need these people at the table.

Mr. Dan Ruimy (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my parliamentary colleagues for their careful review and analysis of our navigation protection legislation.

Many Canadians told us they were unhappy that the previous government's changes were made without an opportunity for them to participate and voice their concerns about the changes. My parliamentary colleagues changed that. They heard from Canadians and responded with recommendations and legislation that would protect Canadians' right to travel on all navigable waters in Canada.

This journey started almost two years ago when the government launched a broader review of environmental and regulatory processes. The broader review included the review of environmental assessment processes, the modernization of the National Energy Board, and the restoration of lost protections for the Fisheries Act and Canada's navigation protection legislation.

Reviewing the Navigation Protection Act is important to parliamentarians, so important that the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities carried its own study of the act. The committee tabled its report in March 2017, taking into the account the views of witnesses and the many submissions received from interested Canadians. The committee's reported findings and recommendations helped supplement our review.

Consultations have been at the heart of this review. I would like to take this opportunity to also thank Canadians who contributed to the committee's study.

The committee's work opened the dialogue on the protections Canadians wanted to see for navigation in Canada. What did we hear? We heard that Canadians wanted to see protections for all waterways in Canada, including those left unprotected by the current law. We also heard that Canadians wanted a smarter way of protecting navigation, one that would put resources where they were needed most.

In June 2017, the government responded to the committee's report, accepting all of its recommendations. Shortly thereafter, the government released a discussion paper, setting out proposals for all four components of the broader review. This kicked off a second phase of consultations.

Consultations were held with other levels of government, indigenous peoples, voters, environmental non-governmental organizations, and industry. What we heard through the summer and early fall of 2017 helped us shape the proposed Canadian navigable waters act introduced in Parliament in February of this year as part of Bill C-69.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the work done by the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. I would also like to thank the committee, the witnesses, and those who made written submissions for their time spent studying the new Canadian navigable waters act and providing their views.

Bill C-69 delivers on the government's commitment to restore lost protections by providing oversight for all works on all navigable waters in Canada. The Canadian navigable waters act in Bill C-69 would keep the minor works order. This order allows works with minor interference to navigation to be built, provided they meet the terms and conditions set out in the order.

The bill also introduces a new major works order. This order would require anyone building a major work with significant interference to navigation to apply to Transport Canada for an approval before building on any navigable water in Canada. Similarly, the bill would also require anyone building works, except minor works, on waters listed on the schedule to apply to Transport Canada for approval.

Works under the new Canadian navigable waters act not covered above would be subject to the new dispute resolution processes set out in the act. This process would require builders to notify the public before starting construction and to resolve any navigation related concerns. If these concerns are not resolved, the builder may be required to apply to Transport Canada for an approval. This process would allow local communities to have a say in the projects that could have an impact on their navigation. This is a good step forward.

I am pleased to see the committee has made important improvements to the new Canadian navigable waters act, including clarifications to the provisions related to indigenous knowledge, the sale of obstructions, and the regulatory power that allows the Governor in Council to exclude small bodies of water from the definition of navigable waters.

● (2300)

Perhaps the most important amendment is the one that makes it clear that changes to water levels and water flows will be considered when assessing the interference that works will have on navigation. Clearly navigation cannot continue if water levels are too low. The impact of works on water levels or water flows will be considered when works are assessed, and conditions can be put in place to mitigate these impacts.

I come from the riding of Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge. We are a watershed community. When I was elected, one of the first things I did was gather a diverse group of people in the community who cared about the environment, who were interested in what was going on, and I listened to them. As a result, we spent almost two years talking to local stream keepers, talking to the municipality, talking to folks who care about the salmon and the connected waters. Through that we were able to put together a report on the Fisheries Act and on making amendments to it.

The one thing I kept hearing over and over again from everyone in my community was that the previous government had gutted not only the Fisheries Act but a lot of acts as well that were supposed to protect our environment. These steps that we are taking now are to restore those lost protections.

I would like to conclude by highlighting the extensive consultations that led us to this bill. Canadians truly had a say in restoring lost protections.

We have built on the foundation of the initial review by the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and the recent review by the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development with what Canadians told us they would like to see in navigation protection. Both committees have provided a key forum for ensuring that the views of Canadians are heard, and the bill responds to these concerns.

I cannot stress enough that I keep hearing from the opposition members that there was nothing wrong with their act, that everything was fine, everything was great, yet that is not what my community was telling me. That is not what I saw in my community. It is not what I see today when I see the challenges we face with fish and fish habitats and our waterways.

Before summer it is possible to canoe on the Katzie Slough with no problems whatsoever, but then halfway through the summer invasive species of plant life take over the entire slough, and people cannot even canoe over it. Those are real problems. They are not problems made up in the House. That is what is happening in our communities right now.

● (2305)

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I have been looking for an opportunity to ask one of the Liberal members this question.

We have a very large elephant in the room here tonight. While we talk about whether this impact assessment will apply to how indigenous people participate or whether the energy regulators will get in the door, the reality is that it is a failure because it no longer applies to the thousands of projects across Canada that were routinely reviewed before 2012.

Between 1975 and 2012, anything under federal jurisdiction required a review. Harper changed that from 4,000 to 5,000 projects a year to fewer than 100. In this bill, restricting reviews to a project list means that the Conservative Harper approach guides this legislation and that we will never see it applied to more than big, major projects, ignoring the advice of the expert panel that reported to the government.

I am heartsick about it. I ask my hon. colleague if there is any chance that amendments can be accepted to allow the bill to do what it should do and apply to all federal jurisdictions.

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Mr. Speaker, when I look at this situation, I ask myself, "How did we get to where we are?" It did not happen overnight. It is a cumulative effect that has gone on for generations and generations.

The connected waters are no longer connected, so where is our starting point? We have to have a starting point. For me, one of the starting points was the Fisheries Act. How do we strengthen our Fisheries Act? How do we strengthen fish habitat? These are the things that allow us to start to move forward. For me, the navigable waters act is one of those things that can at least help us start to move forward and turn back the clock.

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Surrey—Newton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to go to the riding of Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, and I have seen the hon. member having extensive consultations on other subjects. When it comes to this bill, I would like to know from the hon. member if he has done consultations in his riding and if he feels this vigorous and clear process will help the businesses and people in British Columbia.

Mr. Dan Ruimy: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Surrey—Newton is right. The time that I spent has been educational for me.

I grew up in Montreal. I am a city boy. Worms and fish and hooks are not my thing, but I had to learn a lot about fish. I had to learn about the community that I live in, and I was blessed to have people who were ready to show me.

I cannot tell members how many times they kept telling me, "My God, somebody is listening to us. Somebody is paying attention. Somebody is actually bringing us to the table and having these conversations." To me, it meant I was going in the right direction.

What we have before us is just another extension of all the consultations we had, and not only in my riding; the committee also heard from over 80 witnesses and reviewed over 150 submissions. There were 14 months of consultations. They are the reason we are doing this. They help guide us to where we are today.

● (2310)

Hon. Tony Clement (Parry Sound—Muskoka, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House. It is late in the evening, but it is good to see members of the House here to debate this very important issue. I am delighted that I am following the member for Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, because I was in his wonderful community just last week. He may have been aware of that.

I had a wonderful session with the local chamber of commerce, as well as other constituents of his. Funnily enough, this bill never came up. Others topics came up, like this decision by the Liberals to buy a pipeline. A lot of his constituents were very concerned about the financial cost of that decision. A lot of other issues about economic growth and opportunity came up. The issue of affordability of housing came up and how the Liberal government was not addressing it. Therefore, I commend him for his constituents, but they did not talk about the same issues the hon. member has talked about this evening.

I come from Parry Sound—Muskoka. Navigable waters is an important issue in my riding as it is in many other ridings in the country. I have 8,000 lakes in my riding, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, when you drive through it, at the speed limit, on your way to your constituency. However, these issues are important. I think we can all agree in the House that we want sustainable waterways that can be used for generations to come, that we can all enjoy, that are available to citizens.

The issue is this: Is the bill helping us get to where we want to get to? We have heard a lot from the Liberal members about how wonderful the bill is, how it will make a difference. Let us look at some of the actual provisions of the bill and what they would do. When we do that, I think we will come away with a very different impression about how the rhetoric of the bill is one thing, but the actual impact of the bill is something very different.

I draw attention to the fact that the bill is riddled with ministerial exemptions that will delay development of Canada's natural resources, which has an impact on jobs and opportunity and the ability of our society to pay for the sustainability of our waterways and other environmental goals that we have. There is an extension of ministerial authority over the process. I am sure there have been comments on that at committee and at other stages of the debate of the bill.

Some environmental lawyers have opined that the bill would do nothing to enhance the environmental protections. Therefore, that is a significant flaw. That is not just a minor amendment issue. It goes to the heart, to the pith and substance, as we used to say, of the bill. That in itself is a reason for a second thought on it. When Governor in Council and ministerial exemptions can be exercised, this slows down approvals.

I have heard the hon. members on the other side say that we should not worry, that everything will be fine, that they will get approvals through, that they will protect the environment. However, that is not the way it works when we look at the legislation. The ability of the Governor in Council—that is to say the cabinet, the executive council of the government—to slow down the process is very clear.

The addition of the planning process and the associated timelines means that the overall review process is actually longer than what it was under the prior legislation. It will take longer to get a decision. Things will be slower. Red tape will be strangling. That is not good. That certainly is not good for the economy. It actually goes against the idea that we, as a civil society, have the means by which we can come to a negotiated solution to protect our waterways. The government always says it wants economic growth and development. This is a case where it is making it tougher to get the economic growth and development it claims it wants.

This is an issue. With the addition of a joint panel requirement, the end result will be more panels than before. More projects will have longer timelines.

● (2315)

We on this side of the House, in the Conservative Party, do not see an appropriate and sage balance between environmental protection and economic growth. That is the mantra of the government, but when we look at the bill, we are not getting that proper balance. We are in a competitive situation. We know that other jurisdictions are not waiting for Canada to get its act together. They are trying to be more competitive. They are trying to lower taxes and regulation for their citizens to increase economic growth and opportunity, particularly for young people, but this bill is going 180° in the opposite direction.

I know that the government is committed to investing over $1 billion over five years for the new Canadian energy regulator, but, again, we have not heard from government members on how this money will be spent. Where are the details for us, as legislators, to understand how that money will be spent to actually help the new Canadian energy regulator? As I have said, we are quite worried that this would decrease Canadian economic competitiveness without increasing environmental protection. That is the key problem I find with this piece of legislation.

We know that it is part of our responsibilities as members of Parliament to seek out sound economic and environmental policies and to make sure that one is not at the expense of the other. This does not have to be a zero-sum game. On this side of the House, we understand that increased prosperity does lead to better environmental outcomes.

In 2016, Canada's natural resources sector accounted for 16% of economic activity here in Canada and 38% of our non-residential capital investment, but what will kill that is regulatory uncertainty, red tape. That is what has been happening, to an exponential degree, over the last couple of years, to such an extent that Canadian energy investment has declined in the past two years more than in any other two-year period in the last 70 years. I think another hon. member mentioned an elephant in the room. This is the elephant in the room, and this is why this bill is not a solution to Canada's problems.

We urge the government to champion Canadian energy projects and provide regulatory certainty, predictability, and clarity to ensure the viability of these major projects. There are lots of assurances and rhetoric that go with this bill, but we have no real assurance that future projects of national and, indeed, local significance can and would proceed. It does build, unfortunately, on the growing Liberal record of increasing red tape and over-regulation.

On this side of the House, Canada's Conservatives will continue to stand against onerous regulations that destroy jobs, destroy economic growth, and lower our global competitiveness. We will continue to stand for the taxpayer, for the citizen, for the average person who seeks a better life in this country, and for growth and opportunity in Canada, because that is the solution to any environmental challenges. That is the solution for economic growth in the future.

● (2320)

Mr. Dan Ruimy (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for coming to my riding. It is too bad he did not invite me over. We could have had a good conversation. I feel the need to mention that we are here talking about the navigable waters act, for instance, not other issues that the member may have asked questions about.

I keep hearing, time and time again, "less regulation", but where is the climate change piece that is missing from less regulation? Where is the piece that says we have to be able to solve the problem of climate change? Less regulation opens the door to what we have had: the destruction of our coastal areas, fish passages, and fish habitats. That is the result of less regulation.

I would like to know how the member can come to terms with less regulation while protecting the environment.

Hon. Tony Clement: Mr. Speaker, that is an important question. I am not diminishing the question in the least, but it is a bit of a red herring. In no part of my speech did I say "no regulation" and in no part of my remarks did I say "under-regulation". Of course, we have to protect our natural environment. That is part of our duty as citizens of this great country, and of the planet.

However, let me get back to my point. This bill promises to do something that will not happen. Liberals say that we can protect the environment and increase economic growth, and yet this bill will make it tougher, and it will take longer to get legitimate projects through the system. It is because of ministerial discretion, not because of science or some highfalutin principle.

It will be the cabinet that will be able to slow things down. That is a major point of contention in this bill.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on something the member said, because it gets repeated so often in this place, that somehow the current Liberal government has hurt investment in the energy sector.

That is not the case. We have to look globally, and what we find is that investors are fleeing fossil fuel investments. They are divesting. We can look at the many speeches by Mark Carney, who used to be the Governor of the Bank of Canada and is now the Governor of the Bank of England, where he says there is a carbon bubble, and smart companies want to avoid having stranded assets in the oil sands.

That is why ConocoPhillips has left; that is why Shell left; that is why Statoil left; that is why Total left. At the height of the oil sands, it amounted to 2% of our GDP. Large multinationals are leaving because they are investing in renewable energy, because that is where the profits are.

Hon. Tony Clement: Mr. Speaker, I do concede that there has been some investment in renewable energy, and that is, of course, a good thing. Certainly, if business leaders see that as a growth area, far be it for me to second guess that.

However, the fact of the matter is that there has been a lot of uncertainty in the Canadian marketplace, which has seen a disproportionate number of companies fleeing it because of the uncertainty and red tape over the last couple of years. That point is undeniable. When we see a 70% drop in a two-year period of that kind of investment in Canada, that is not a worldwide trend. There is no worldwide 70% drop.

It is clear that it is the actions of the current government and its policies, of its saying one thing and doing something very different, that have caused this crisis in natural resources development. It can be a sustainable development, but not when the government puts so many onerous preconditions on this kind of development.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-69. I want to take a moment to talk specifically about some of the deficiencies of the bill. Then I would like to talk a bit more about a general pattern of behaviour that the bill fits into, which is problematic in and of itself.

With respect to the bill, Canadians were upset with the previous government and its approach to environmental assessment, if we can call it that. The previous government really gutted the existing environmental assessment process. The key feature of that gutting in my opinion and the opinion of many Canadians across the country was that the Harper government essentially made the final approval of large natural resource projects a political decision at the cabinet table. It became a decision that was not inherently tied to evidence, to science, to predictable impacts with respect to the effect of these projects on the climate. It was not tied to the rights of indigenous peoples to have a say over what happens on their own land. It was simply a political decision to be taken by cabinet. Therefore, one would think that a party that ran against the Harper Conservatives, in part because the latter had gutted environmental assessments and the Liberals committed to Canadians in the election that they would fix that, would have to address the issue of that approval becoming essentially just a prerogative of the government to make according to its own reasons.

The problem with Bill C-69 is that after waiting well over two years for the government to present its fix to the Harper approach to approving these projects, the bill does not in fact do that. It maintains the absolute prerogative of the government to plow ahead, irrespective of the facts, the science on a particular project, or the views of many first nations that may be affected by a particular project. To me, that is a clear and obvious deficiency in the legislation. It does not meet the commitment the Liberals made in the last election to Canadians who are really concerned about this issue. One of the clearest and most obvious things those Canadians wanted was to try to depoliticize the approval process for many of these projects and to have decisions based on science and evidence. It was not to allow the government a choice as to whether or not to go along with the science and the evidence, but to bake it into the process so that the government would not have a choice other than make decisions based on that evidence, or to have an independent body make that decision based on that evidence and science. That is a clear deficiency with the bill, and one that is very disappointing.

With regard to the rights of indigenous people being respected in the approval of these kinds of projects, my colleague, the member for Edmonton Strathcona, presented a number of amendments that would not have put that commitment in the preamble alone, which is what the government ultimately decided to do. The government's decision to put that commitment in the preamble gives us a measure of how strong its commitment to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples really is, because the preamble is non-binding. That, of course, is the kind of commitment that Liberals seem to prefer, the non-binding ones. That was evidenced in their rejection of a number of amendments that would have given UNDRIP real force and effect in the environmental review process. Putting that commitment in the preamble does not give UNDRIP real effect. They are nice words, but they do not get the job done when we have a government that is not interested in respecting the rights of indigenous people. What indigenous people needed was something with the force of law that they could take to court when the government trampled on their rights. The Liberals opted not to do that, and it really does not do it a service to say that it was a missed opportunity.

It is wrong for them not to have done that. It is wrong in principle, but it is also wrong in light of the commitment they just made in voting in support of Bill C-262 last week, which is essentially all about trying to implement UNDRIP within Canadian law. It is wrong, according to the claims of the Prime Minister, who often says that the nation-to-nation relationship is one of the most important relationships.

● (2325)

In light of all those things, it was clearly wrong for the government to do that.

It is part of a theme on a number of files within the government, where the attitude is that we should just trust the government. The government admits there is a lot of discretion, but it says discretion allows it to do the right thing, and it wants to do the right thing. It does not think it has to put the right thing in law or require itself to do the right thing, because it really wants to do it, so we should just take its word for it. That is what is happening with Bill C-69. That is what it means to maintain ministerial prerogative to decide on a project regardless of the evidence.

We heard the minister say something to that effect in the debate on time allocation earlier, when she said that the government cares about science and evidence and therefore it does not need to put a requirement in the law to make decisions based on science and evidence. She said that if we wait and look at the decisions the government makes, we will see, in hindsight, that they were based on science and evidence.

I do not think that this is what Canadians were asking for when they elected a government that said it was going to create a new process based on science and evidence. It is a bad way of making law. It means that a future government that comes in will not be required to do that, just as the current government is not.

Frankly, I do not think the Liberals are really committed, in many cases, to evidence-based decision-making. They would not have bought a 65-year-old leaky pipeline for far more than it is worth if they were actually serious about making information-based decisions. We could go down that road, but even if we do not, it is very clear that if one's commitment is to build a good process, this process should not rely on the goodwill of the government of the day. It should be a process that requires the government of the day to do the right thing, notwithstanding who is in power. This bill obviously fails that test.

We saw something similar with Bill C-49 with respect to voice and video recording devices in locomotives. The government said that we need not worry because it has no interest in invading the privacy rights of workers, and that it would look after it, but without putting it into law; it would just put it in regulations. The government asked us, when voting on the legislation, to trust that it would do the right thing later in regulation.

● (2330)

Never mind the fact that even if the current government does the right thing, and we have not seen that yet, it is still up to some future government to simply change the regulations by order in council without coming to Parliament, because it is not in the law. I do not think the government has done any great favour to workers in that industry by setting up a law that could be so easily abused.

We have seen a similar thing from the government when it comes to approving funding for all its new budget initiatives for 2018-19. It is asking for approval of over $7 billion up front. Department officials and ministers have been very clear in committee that they do not actually have a plan for the money yet. They do not know what they are going to do with that money yet. They have not designed the program, and it has not been to the Treasury Board. They do not know how many people they are going to hire. They do not know whether they will build a building, rent an office, or use existing space. They do not know if they will be travelling across the country. The government does not know what it is going to be spending the money on, but its answer is clear: We should just trust it that things are going to work out and that everything will be okay.

Canadians are looking to the government for leadership on a number of issues, whether it be fiscal responsibility, or being open and accountable, or the very important issues that Bill C-69 is at least nominally meant to address. I have given some indication that I am not convinced it actually addresses those issues.

Regardless of the issue, when Canadians are looking for leadership, they are looking for legislation that holds the government to account. If the government of the day is sincere in giving its word, it should not mind being held to a higher standard, allowing Canadians to test that in court if they have to. Hopefully it will not come to that and the government will keep its word, which remains to be seen.

Canadians deserve to have the tools to hold the government to its word. They also deserve to have future governments bound by those things. At the very least, if a future government wants to change that, it should have to come to Parliament to make the case to Canada's elected representatives, instead of being able to do it fly-by-night through regulation. That is the problem with Bill C-69.

● (2335)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a quote about Bill C-69 from the *National Post*. It reads:

> Bill C-69 outlines a number of factors that the minister must consider before approving a project including sustainability and impacts on indigenous groups and on Canada's ability to meet its climate change commitments. That's an improvement over the existing system where the government's reasons for project approvals are often 'mysterious' according to Jamie Mean, spokesperson for Mining Watch Canada.

I would just like the member's comments on that quote. Could he say whether or not he feels this quote reflects the fact that we have a bill that is an improvement on the existing process brought in by the Conservatives?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the problem is that notwithstanding any virtues of the process proposed in Bill C-69, if the minister is the one who will decide whether the process will be applied to a project or not, because the process itself is not mandatory, and if at the end of it the minister is able to simply ignore the outcomes of the process, then no, we would not have a process that is fundamentally better than the one the Harper government had, because the government could ignore it at will.

The major problem with the Harper process as far as I am concerned is that at the end of the day, the government, for whatever reason, could simply ignore the science and the evidence. That fundamentally has not changed.

Incidentally, members looking to the *National Post* to validate whether or not their policies are progressive are probably barking up the wrong tree.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, in fairness, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis was quoting the *National Post* in reference to Jamie Mean of Mining Watch Canada, who is not the usual go-to sources for the *National Post*.

I happen to be struggling with this legislation because it is, without question, marginally better than Bill C-38 in 2012. The Liberals promised in their platform to restore what we had been in place before, that it would restore public trust and repair the damage done when the original Canadian Environmental Assessment Act brought in by Brian Mulroney was repealed by Bill C-38. This has not been restored. This has not been repaired. This has largely been entrenched.

Does my friend from Elmwood—Transcona have any theories as to why the Liberal government spent over $1 million on a National Energy Board expert panel and over $1 million on a separate environmental assessment expert panel that held hearings across the country? The expert panel on EA by the way went to 21 cities, heard from over 1,000 witnesses, produced a terrific report, and its recommendations were thrown under the proverbial bus.

What on earth was going on? I really cannot answer the question, but maybe my friend from Elmwood—Transcona could speculate.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, it would be speculation indeed, because it does not seem to make a lot of sense to have commissioned that work, have it done, and then largely ignore it.

We saw something similar with the Special Committee on Electoral Reform. There was a budget for that committee too. It did a lot of travel, heard from a number of witnesses, and produced a really great report. Everybody put a bit of water in their wine to clear the path for the government to move forward and make good on its election commitment. Without really even taking time to consider that report, the government decided to throw it in the wastepaper bin. It is a theme, but the motivation behind that theme is not exactly clear.

On the issue of electoral reform, by way of analogy to Bill C-69, one could imagine the government creating a really good proportional representation voting system that actually satisfied Canadians who voted for change, but putting in a caveat in the bill that the government of the day could decide in advance of an election whether it would use that process or the old process. I do not think anybody would say that made sense. Right?

Effectively, the ministerial discretion to decide whether to apply this framework to a project and then to ignore it afterwards would be a further caveat. We would be saying, "If we had the election and we do not like the results, we will actually just rescind it and then will redo the election under the old process". Nobody would think that was a good idea and effectively that is what is happening here.

There may be virtues in the change to the process, but the real problem is whether the process will be applied and whether it has to be respected once it is seen through.

● (2340)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, whether it is the Prime Minister, the Minister of Environment, or the minister responsible for natural resources, we hear time and time again that we need to recognize that the environment and the economy go hand in hand, and it needs to be repeated. If we say it enough, maybe the Conservatives and the NDP will begin to understand that there is a great deal of merit in that idea.

Canadians understand that idea. If the Conservatives and the New Democrats would listen to what Canadians have to say about the issue, they would find that they are in fact offside on what I believe is very important legislation.

It is interesting that it appears that both opposition parties are going to vote against the legislation. I am not 100% sure about the New Democrats, but I believe they are going to be voting against it too, and possibly the Green Party will be voting against it as well.

They have different reasons. The Conservatives are saying that we are putting in too much regulation and are being too hard on free enterprise. My New Democratic friends are on the other end. They are saying that we need to put in more regulation and more restrictions.

The reality is that if the NDP cannot get onside or understand the true national interest with respect to the Trans Mountain expansion project, then it is very clear that they do not support pipelines, because if they cannot support this one, then they cannot support any pipeline, as far as I am concerned. I suspect that after listening to what the NDP has to say, that is the conclusion that a vast majority of Canadians would reach.

Then we have my Conservative friends, who are on the other end. They are great in opposition, far better in opposition than they ever were in government. I can tell members that much. If I look at what the Conservatives are saying, I see that at first they were saying that the Liberal government was not doing enough and that they wanted to see a pipeline, even though for 10 years they could not build an inch of pipeline to tidewater.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: We built four. We built four pipelines.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: The Conservatives can heckle whatever they want. The reality is that they did not build one inch of pipeline to tidewater. They failed. There were 10 years of failure on that front. What they asked for was to see a pipeline built, because they could not do it.

Now we have a government that is actually making it happen. One would think the Conservatives would be happy to see that, but no. Now they are asking why the government is buying a pipeline. Do I need to remind them that it was Harper who bought automobile shares to protect an industry? Imagine the thousands of jobs that were saved because of the Harper decision to invest in the automobile industry. That money was ultimately returned. Need I remind them they cashed out a billion dollars on it in the last budget they presented? Why are they saying no to Alberta, and to Canada as a whole? That is the challenge I put to my Conservative friends, because it just does not make any sense.

What does Bill C-69 do? It protects our environment, fish, and waterways. This is good stuff. We are re-establishing public confidence in the environment and in economic development because they can go hand in hand. We are also respecting indigenous rights.

If I go back to my New Democratic friends, they will point out that there is a group that is in opposition to it. The logic of the NDP, which at times can be a challenge, is that if we do not get 100% buy-in, then we should kill the project, no matter what the project is. That seems to be the New Democrats' approach to economic development. I think they owe it to Canadians to be a little more clear and transparent.

● (2345)

I believe we have seen political parties on all sides recognize exactly what we have been able to accomplish with regard to the Trans Mountain expansion project. It is something the Conservatives could not accomplish. Whenever you have a major project, there are divisions, even within the NDP ranks. Take a look at the premier of Alberta. What does she have to say? She is very encouraging and very positive that we finally have a national government able to get the job done. On the other hand, we have the NDP in British Columbia who are determined to kill the project, and now we have the national party, whose position is a little harder to peg, but I think in the last week or so it has become very clear that it does not see the value of pipelines.

I will tell members why it is in Canada's national best interest from the narrow perspective of my province of Manitoba. We can talk about the thousands of jobs that will be created and the endless opportunities for indigenous people and communities in all regions of our country. We will all benefit from it. However, I want to focus on something that does not get talked about very often, which is that the Province of Manitoba will spend roughly $6 billion on health care, and probably quite a bit more than that. It has been awhile since I was a member of the Manitoba legislature, but we are very dependent on equalization payments, transfer payments, and so forth. A province like Alberta, for example, contributes billions of dollars towards equalization. If Manitoba did not receive that kind of funding, we would be unable to provide the type of services we do in health care, education, and many of the social programs that are so very important and part of what I believe Manitobans and all Canadians would like to see.

When I first learned that we were acquiring the Trans Mountain expansion project, I felt very good about it. I thought this is what it means to be in government, which is to have a vision that would ultimately see Canada continuing to grow. Our middle class today will be healthier tomorrow as a direct result of this acquisition. At the end of the day, that was a commitment we made to voters back in 2015. We committed to looking at ways to build Canada's middle class and those aspiring to be a part of it, and to look at ways to strengthen our economy.

However, those naysayers, the New Democrats, do not understand or appreciate the importance of energy and getting our commodities to market, and would rather say no to anything and everything. The Conservatives do not appreciate the importance of our environment and respecting indigenous rights.

On this side of the House, this Prime Minister and this caucus understand the value of a government that is prepared to make tough decisions that will have a profoundly positive impact in many different ways in every region of the country. I am so proud to be part of a government that does not shy away from acting in the national best interest. That, to me, is one reason we should all be getting behind the Trans Mountain project and, specifically, this proposed legislation.

This proposed legislation would reinforce that trust by having, for example, the Canadian energy regulator ensure that on the issues the agencies are addressing, the required conditions are in fact being met. That would be a good thing. There would be more efficiency. At the end of the day, we will be better off with the passage of this legislation.

● (2350)

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as always, it was very interesting to hear the hon. member speak. He talked about the billions and billions of dollars that my province has contributed through equalization. Of course, folks in my province are very concerned about the approach of the Liberal government and will be particularly interested in the member expressing his excitement at the possibility that his government would acquire a pipeline. He said, "this is what it means to be in government". I wonder if the hon. member realizes how ridiculous that sounds.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I fully disagree with the question. One can twist and take words out and try to manipulate a situation. The reality is that Stephen Harper and his government failed Albertans, the Prairies, and in fact all of Canada by not being able to get the job done. Within two and a half years, this government was able to get the job done and is prepared to generate—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to point out that for the last part of what the hon. parliamentary secretary said, the microphones were not on. I was trying to hear because of the shouting. I just want to remind everyone that I am trying to hear what is being said. We are all tired. I just want to make sure that we remember what the rules are: One person speaks at a time. It is a difficult concept, but I am sure we can figure it out.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Cowichan—Malahat—Langford.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North is an absolute master of hyperbole and revisionist history. When I look at the Liberal platform of 2015, I fail to see a commitment to buy a pipeline for $4.5 billion, but what I do see in there and what I clearly remember is the Prime Minister making a promise to British Columbians on August 20, 2015 that we would have a redone process. The ministerial panel was very flawed. There were so many problems with it, and that is why British Columbians and many other Canadians had problems with this process. Despite the problems of that panel, it still came out with a recommendation saying that Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline proposal cannot proceed without a serious reassessment of its impacts on climate change commitments, indigenous rights, and marine mammal safety.

Given all the criticism of what is going on, and all the factual evidence, surely even the member for Winnipeg North can admit that the reason there is so much opposition to this is that there was a flawed process and his government fundamentally failed to repair the damage of the previous government. The Liberals failed to live up to their promise, and that is why people are protesting. They do not have faith in the current government.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the member opposite. I was hoping my New Democratic friend would provide his thoughts when I made the statement, not only once or twice but on several occasions, even tonight and earlier in the week, in terms of the position of the NDP on the whole issue of pipelines. Canadians have a right to know that the NDP does not support pipelines, period. That is a fairly strong statement that I have made, and I have never had a New Democrat stand in his or her place and say that I was wrong in that assertion.

In following the debates of this chamber over the years, I have found that the New Democrats would just as soon not see one pipeline built, and yet they talk about trying to work with the energy sector and so forth. However, their actions speak louder than words. It is almost as if they oppose government intervention at times. I believe government intervention at times is a good thing. That is the reason why this government got involved. If the government had not gotten involved, there is a very good chance that the pipeline would not have gone through. Maybe that would have made the New Democrats happy. I suspect it might even have made the Conservatives happy. However, it would not have been in the best national interest. That is why this government took it seriously and we wanted to make sure the job got done.

● (2355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Resuming debate, the hon. member for Battlefords—Lloydminster. I just want to remind the hon. member that she has about five minutes, and then she will be able to resume when this takes place again.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, and almost tomorrow, to speak to Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

I appreciate this opportunity to speak to this legislation, as the measures proposed in it would have a significant impact on the constituents in my riding. The energy sector is a central industry in my riding of Battlefords—Lloydminster, and ensuring the industry's viability and growth going forward is crucial to my constituents. While the responsible development of our natural resources is important to my riding, it is equally as important to all Canadians.

Our country owes a lot of its prosperity to our natural resources, a fact that even the Prime Minister has admitted. In his mandate letter to the Minister of Natural Resources, he wrote, "Throughout Canada's history, our prosperity has been built on our natural resources." It is a fact that he cannot and should not forget. Our development of natural resources creates jobs in Canada and economic development, and through taxes, it contributes significant revenues to the government.

The energy sector is a key natural resource sector in Canada. It creates over 800,000 Canadian jobs and represents nearly 10% of Canada's nominal GDP. Those figures are nothing to scoff at. Unfortunately, despite the Prime Minister's acknowledgement of the importance of our natural resources, both his actions and inactions have come with a tremendous price tag.

The Liberal government has a terrible record when it comes to Canada's energy sector. While the members across the aisle may want to claim that this legislation is a positive step for the future of our energy sector, that is just not the case, and the Liberals simply cannot be trusted on this file.

This legislation proposes a one project, one review system for approving proposed projects. In principle this looks very positive, but a closer look at this bill quickly reveals that it is full of measures that could be taken to slow down the approval process. In actuality, the process that has been outlined is lengthier.

This perhaps comes as no surprise to many, as we have repeatedly seen the Prime Minister make promises to Canadians and then fail to deliver on them. In fact, since forming government, the Prime Minister has repeatedly failed our energy sector. The recent taxpayer purchase of the Kinder Morgan pipeline is a great example of the Prime Minister's failure, a failure with a $4.5-billion price tag and one that puts Canadian taxpayers on the hook for billions more in costs.

I remind my colleagues that Kinder Morgan never asked for a single dollar of taxpayer money. All it asked for was that the government provide certainty that a pipeline could be built. Even though the Liberals approved the expansion of the Kinder Morgan pipeline, they sat on their hands and did not champion it. Kinder Morgan was not given the certainty it asked for. Instead, it saw delay after delay after delay.

● (2400)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. member will have five minutes and 45 seconds the next time Bill C-69 comes up for debate.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a question I asked of the government back in February. The government rubber stamped the sale to Anbang Insurance, a large Chinese company that owns a number of retirement villages in British Columbia, including the Waverly Seniors Village in my riding of Chilliwack—Hope. The government approved the sale to Anbang Insurance. We warned it about that sale and it went ahead and rubber stamped it anyway. This was just after the founder of the company had been sentenced to 18 years in jail for committing fraud and the Government of China had taken over the company. Now we have a situation where the Government of China owns Anbang Insurance, which owns retirement facilities all across the country, including in my riding.

The Government of Canada approved that sale one year before this fraud trial took place and the founder of Anbang was thrown in jail for 18 years. Is the government proud of the fact that it approved a sale that has now put seniors' retirement homes in the hands of the Chinese government?

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government has made clear its commitment to an open economy that welcomes trade and benefits all Canadians. Investment by foreign companies has long played an important role in our economy, but we acknowledge that such investment must be to Canada's net benefit.

Because investment flows into the country are important, Canada has put in place a broad framework to promote trade and investment while at the same time protecting Canadian interests.

The Investment Canada Act is the primary mechanism for reviewing foreign investments in Canada. In making this decision, as in all decisions under the ICA, the facts around the investment, the investor's plans for the Canadian business, and its undertakings were considered. Also, in conducting reviews under the ICA, relevant provincial governments and other federal departments are consulted for their views and expertise.

In this case, British Columbia's Ministry of Health was consulted and a number of third-party submissions informed the review. The review process is thorough and rigorous and not a rubber-stamp exercise, as the hon. member has suggested. The licences for Retirement Concepts were issued by the Government of British Columbia, which regulates senior care facilities in the province. B.C.'s regulatory regime imposes rigorous standards of care on all operators of residential care and assisted living facilities, regardless of their ultimate ownership.

The B.C. Health Authorities have approved the new ownership and have confirmed this. Retirement Concepts will continue to remain subject to the provincial regulatory requirements by the British Columbia Ministry of Health under its Community Care & Assisted Living Act. Does the member opposite not trust that the provincial authorities have the ability to oversee retirement residences?

With regard to ICA, Cedar Tree must report regularly to the minister on its compliance with the undertakings. Officials continue to carefully monitor Cedar Tree's compliance.

● (2405)

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Speaker, listening to the parliamentary secretary, one would think this was a runaway success. The fact is that a Chinese company has now gone into the hands of the Chinese government, and somehow the government's approval of that deal was good thing not only for the people of Canada but for the seniors living in the Waverly Seniors Village in Chilliwack. The review process clearly failed. We are at a point today where the Government of China is the effective owner of Canadian retirement centres.

How is it a net benefit to my constituents living in the Waverly Seniors Village in Chilliwack that the government approved this sale to Anbang Insurance?

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, while the opposition might engage in these types of scare tactics and fearmongering, let us talk about the facts. The day-to-day operation of seniors home remains under the control of Retirement Concepts. It is the same management that was there before. The residences continue to be subject to the same provincial health regulations to which they have always been subject.

The residents and health care workers will continue to be protected under the same legislation and regulations as before. As I have said before, we continue to actively monitor Cedar Tree and its compliance with its legal obligations.

Due to the confidentiality provisions of the Investment Canada Act, I and my colleagues cannot comment further on this investment. I can assure the member that officials are carefully monitoring the situation and are in close contact with Cedar Tree, provincial regulators and other relevant stakeholders.

Adjournment Proceedings

JUSTICE

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I will add some context for people watching at home. British Columbia is three hours behind, so maybe people are still up.

These late show debates are an opportunity to follow up after having 30 seconds to ask a question in question period and the government side having only 30 seconds to answer. Sometimes we do not really get a full answer. Maybe it is because 30 seconds is not long enough to ask a good question. I remain hopeful and I take advantage of these opportunities to have four minutes to ask a more extensive question, and then the government can take longer to respond.

When I asked my question, it was just after the terrible story of Tina Fontaine, a young girl in Manitoba who weighed only 72 pounds. She was murdered. Her trial was a mess, and it was a terrible disappointment when her accused killer was not convicted. There was no hope for the family of what might happen with her case. It was a real blow to the hope that the country would—through the justice system, the social support system, the social safety net, by repairing the damage of the residential school system, by repairing the damage of the child welfare system—give the families of murdered and missing indigenous women and girls some hope.

It was in this context that I asked the government how it would support the inquiry to ensure there would no more Tina Fontaines and to ensure we supported the families and survivors.

We had great hope in the murdered and missing indigenous women and girls Inquiry. We need it to do its work. We need this from a social justice point of view, but we also need this to move forward as a nation.

Since that debate, some other terrible news came out. The families that were working with the inquiry, trusting it with their stories, were encouraged to ask for the kinds of counselling and aftercare that would help them after they had gone through the trauma of telling their stories.

This was reported by CBC on May 8. Families that were submitting bills for aftercare were being nickel-and-dimed by both the inquiry and the Privy Council Office. An elder was hired by the family of Joan Winning, the aunt of Nicole Daniels, a 16-year-old girl who was found murdered. She died of hypothermia, but there were complications. People were concerned this was a violent act. They were told they needed an invoice from the elder. It was completely disrespectful to the family, but also the elders, who are not business people.

The inquiry was stuck in between the families and the government and Privy Council Office bureaucracy. This blew up on the front pages of the news across the country just when we needed to build some faith for the families that they would be well cared for.

Again, what is the government doing to ensure families do not have these terrible experiences of being disrespected by our federal government bureaucracy at the time when they need us to treat them with the most sensitivity possible?

● (2430)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to answer the question from my hon. colleague by noting that we are on the traditional territory of the Algonquin people, which I did not mention the first time I stood.

I want to take a moment to express my deepest sympathies to Tina Fontaine's family, friends, and community. When she went missing, she was 15 years old, and my daughter had turned 15 at that time too. I will never forget her name.

Her story underscores the important work being done by the national inquiry. The national inquiry is looking into the causes of the systemic and institutional failures that led to Tina's murder, and to the murders of far too many other indigenous women and girls. The families of the victims, and all Canadians, deserve to know why.

The national inquiry's interim report was released on November 1 last year. It includes a literature review of 98 reports on violence against indigenous women and girls in Canada.

Our government is taking action to address the interim recommendations of the national inquiry. Canada is increasing health supports and victim services and establishing a commemoration fund. Our government is funding organizations with expertise in law enforcement and policing to lead a review of police policies and practices concerning police's relations with the indigenous peoples they serve. Canada is also supporting a Royal Canadian Mounted Police national investigative standards and practices unit with additional funding.

The six-month extension to the inquiry announced yesterday will provide the commission with the time needed to complete their work, while balancing the needs of families who have been waiting years for answers. This extension will also allow the commission, if it chooses, to hear from the rest of the families, and for further institutional and expert hearings.

Tina Fontaine's story is too familiar to families across the country. It is reflective of Canada's neglectful and shameful relationship with indigenous peoples for more than 150 years.

It is time to change that story, and the government is taking action while the national inquiry undertakes its important work. With budgets 2016, 2017 and 2018, the Government of Canada has provided unprecedented funding for indigenous and northern communities, of nearly $16.8 billion. The money will benefit indigenous women and girls in the areas of education, language, culture, safe water, housing, and women's shelters, training, access to capital, and child and family services. The money has also gone toward increasing safety on the Highway of Tears.

It is a comprehensive approach, because that is what is needed to root out this systemic problem. The government is also undertaking work on a comprehensive strategy to end gender-based violence. We are committed to ending this national tragedy. We will ensure that families get the answers they are looking for.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson: Mr. Speaker, I think the difficulty with this is the bureaucracy of the federal government. It should be able to facilitate the work of the inquiry, but that has just not happened.

The inquiry, in its interim report of November 1, said that eight of the 10 problems they were facing were all with federal government bureaucracy. None of those problems were addressed in the government's response. The minister said yesterday that "We're well on our way", and that they were within a week of that November 1 report. However, the evidence does not back that up.

On May 1, the inquiry sent a letter to the families, saying that the payment delays were unacceptable, that the Privy Council Office was responsible, and that the guidelines were laborious. The families say they have phoned the inquiry and that nobody returns their calls.

How can that be the headline, given the imperative of doing this important work that my colleague cites?

● (2435)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes: Mr. Speaker, again, the extension that was granted yesterday does allow for some of that work to be done.

Our government's work on ending violence against indigenous women and girls is grounded in the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Articles 7 and 22 in particular speak to indigenous peoples' rights to live free of violence, and the responsibility of states to protect indigenous women and girls.

The calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada also guide our efforts. The commission has pressed Canada to act by providing culturally relevant services to indigenous inmates, and by collecting and publishing data on family violence, as well as tracking our progress on reducing rates of violence.

We are committed to ending this ongoing national tragedy.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Canada's interactions with the Iranian regime. The questions I have posed before I feel have, by and large, gone unanswered.

A Liberal MP, during the throes of a protest movement against the authoritarian, theocratic government of Iran, said that this Iranian government was elected. This comment was deeply offensive to the Iranian community and to Iran's democracy movement, right at a moment when they were fighting for their fundamental rights. Does the Government of Canada agree with its MP's characterization of Iran's government as elected, or does it not? This is something it should be willing to say.

The Iranian regime is a leading sponsor of global terror, murder, and violence. The Government of Iran played a major role, we have now learned, in supporting Hamas-instigated violence on Israel's border, violence for which the Prime Minister called out Israel, not Hamas or Iran. Why did the Prime Minister issue a statement that did not call out Iran and Hamas?

The Canadian government called for an independent investigation into alleged actions by Israel during the border clashes but has asked Iran to investigate itself over the killing of Canadian professor Seyed-Emami in an Iranian prison. Why does the government seem more confident in Iran's capacity for neutral self-assessment than in Israel's?

There has been a very tepid response from the government, in general, to Iranian aggression and human rights violations. There has been an insistence on continuing to pursue warmer relations, with the government going so far as to directly finance an aerospace deal with Iran.

Some of my friends across the way want to profess their commitment to advocating for human rights in Iran. If so, it should not be difficult to denounce the Iranian government and reject the claim from one of their colleagues that it is elected. Hold the Government of Iran responsible for the violence it instigates in the region, and acknowledge the obvious reality that people do not die in Evin prison by suicide.

As the opposition, it is our job to ask tough, serious questions about the failure of the government to stand up for fundamental human rights in Iran and in many other places.

What is going on here in terms of the government's failure to expect democracy and stand up for human rights, including the rights of Canadians? If we look at the aerospace dimension and the opportunity for Bombardier's shareholders, there is a legitimate question about whether the government is making its decision on the basis of the interests of Bombardier, instead of on the basis of Canadian and universal human values.

However, I think there is something else going on here, when we look at its approach to Iran. This is what Michael Gerson calls the soft bigotry of low expectations that plagues the actions of western countries in their interactions with many nations in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. That is, the same states that criticize real or perceived declines in democracy in European or American states, in many cases have much less to say about worse abuses of process and fundamental human rights in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. Why do governments single out Israel for criticism, for example, while ignoring other abuses in the region? Perhaps, to some extent, this is also rooted in the soft bigotry of low expectations. So much less criticism is directed toward authoritarian states in the region, perhaps because, unfortunately, much less is expected of them.

Human rights, universal citizenship, and democracy are the birthright of all people, affirmed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and are the necessary consequence of recognizing our shared humanity.

On this side of the House, we reject the soft bigotry of low expectations for Iran. We believe that freedom, democracy, human rights, and the rule of law are the proper birthright of the Iranian people. They want it, they deserve it, and they will have it. The question for us is simply whether we will be on their side or not.

We need to know where the Government of Canada stands on this claim from a Liberal MP that the Iranian government is elected. Why did the Prime Minister issue a statement that failed to call out Iran and Hamas for their instigation of violence against Israel? Why does the government seem more confident in Iran's capacity for neutral self-assessment than in Israel's? These questions, which I have asked many times before, demand an answer.

● (2420)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there were a number of issues in my hon. colleague's comments, so I will take the time to answer some of them.

Contrary to what the member has implied, there have been no high-level meetings in Ottawa with Iranian officials involving the Government of Canada on the subject of this unconfirmed sale, nor is the government privy to any details regarding this unconfirmed sale. The government was first made aware of this potential sale from media sources, and Bombardier has not asked Global Affairs for any assistance in the sale of aircraft to Iran. At no time have Iranian officials discussed such a potential sale with Global Affairs.

[*Translation*]

Canada is maintaining its strict sanctions and export controls on goods listed as proliferation-sensitive in Iran, including goods and technology that could potentially further the development of Iran's nuclear programs and ballistic missiles.

[*English*]

Furthermore, Canada continues to list Iran as a state supporter of terrorism under the State Immunity Act, lifting its immunity and allowing civil action to be taken against it under the Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act. Canada has also listed the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as being involved in Iran's external operations as a terrorist entity under Canada's Criminal Code.

Canada also continues to demand an inquiry into the detention and tragic death of Canadian Dr. Kavous Seyed-Emami in Iran's Evin prison. We continue to call on Iranian authorities to immediately give his widow, Maryam Monbeini, the freedom to exit Iran and return to Canada. The government has publicly stated on several occasions that as long as Ms. Monbeini is not able to leave Iran, the focus of any discussions with Iran will be on her coming home.

Canadians expect that their government will protect their interests and values abroad, stand up for human rights, and to provide consular services to Canadians in distress in Iran, such as the families of Dr. Seyed-Emami and Ms. Monbeini, and others. Providing these consular services and speaking up on behalf of human rights victims requires the ability to engage. We must take action that will serve and protect Canadians abroad.

Engagement and dialogue are about protecting interests and promoting values. They are not about ignoring actions we find objectionable or legitimizing governments that violate human rights. This government wants to address our international challenges head-on. Iranian behaviour represents one of the greatest challenges we currently face on the international stage. If we fail to engage, we fail to understand, and if we fail to understand, we are more likely to end up in a position where we have fewer good options. Protecting Canadian interests and promoting Canadian values are much harder to then accomplish. This government chooses dialogue and engagement as the best way to protect Canadian interests and values.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague's comment about aerospace, I turned up two articles on Google in the time that she was talking. The first is from Reuters, entitled, "Canada to lift Tehran sanctions, allow Bombardier to export to Iran". It is from a couple of years ago, actually. The second article is entitled "Minister sees Iran thaw as opportunity for Canadian aerospace industry". We have all seen these headlines.

To her other comments, she spoke about the value of engagement. Let us be clear that Zahra Kazemi was a Canadian citizen who died in an Iranian prison at the time of the previous Liberal government. I am not blaming it, of course, but the fact is that we had diplomatic relations at the time. Let us be clear as well that downgrading diplomatic relations is a tool that countries use in response to protest terrible human rights abuses and threatening international behaviour. In fact, the Minister of Foreign Affairs spoke today before the foreign affairs committee about downgrading our diplomatic relationship with Venezuela in response to violations of human rights.

Again, why the different treatment of Iran? Why the—

● (2425)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as mentioned, there have been no meetings on record with Iranian officials and the government around the sale, so I am not sure. The hon. member is pulling this information up, but we do not have those records.

Diplomacy is a necessary tool to defend Canada's interests and protect Canadian values. It is all the more necessary when dealing with a country that challenges our interests and rejects our values. We feel strongly that it is through dialogue and not through withdrawal or isolation that we can best advance Canada's interests, including the resolution of complex and sensitive consular cases like the ones described earlier.

To be clear, however, there have been no high-level meetings again here in Ottawa with Iranian officials involving the Government of Canada on the subject of the unconfirmed sale. Iran is a political opponent challenging the interests of Canada and of our friends and allies. We can deal with this challenge—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Pursuant to the order made Tuesday, May 29, the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until later today at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 12:26 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 6, 2018

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Impact Assessment Act

Bill C-69. Report stage 20421
Mr. Aldag 20421
Mr. Godin 20422
Mr. MacGregor 20423
Mr. Gourde 20423
Mr. Johns 20425
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20425
Mr. Lamoureux 20425
Mr. Sopuck 20425
Mrs. Schulte 20426
Mr. Godin 20427
Ms. Blaney (North Island—Powell River) 20427
Mrs. Gallant 20428
Mr. Scarpaleggia 20429
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20430
Mr. Anderson 20430
Mr. Rogers 20430
Mrs. Vecchio 20431
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20432
Mr. Ruimy 20432
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20433
Mr. Dhaliwal 20434
Mr. Clement 20434
Mr. Ruimy 20435
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20435
Mr. Blaikie 20436
Mr. Scarpaleggia 20437
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) 20437
Mr. Lamoureux 20438
Mr. Lake 20439
Mr. MacGregor 20439
Mrs. Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) 20440

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Investment

Mr. Strahl 20440
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20440

Justice

Ms. Malcolmson 20441
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20442

Foreign Affairs

Mr. Genuis 20442
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20443
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes 20444

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca